



THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JANUARY, 1854.

No. CCI.

- ART. I.—1. *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*. Edited by LORD JOHN RUSSELL. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1853.
2. *Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George the Third, from original Family Documents*. By the DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS, K. G. 2 vols. 8vo. Second edition, revised. London: 1853.

THESE two publications throw so much light on the political history of England during the latter part of the last century, that, although they are both unfinished, we think it right to give our readers an account of their contents, without waiting for their completion.

The late Lord Holland, having abandoned his original design of writing the life of his uncle, Mr. Fox, made a full compilation of authentic materials for his biography, partly consisting of letters and other documents, partly of records of the recollections of his surviving friends. Lord Holland, unhappily, left this compilation unfinished at his death; but it afterwards passed into the hands of his confidential friend, Mr. Allen, who was in every way qualified to complete the work which had been thus begun. Mr. Allen appears to have brought the materials into a state fitted for publication — but the MS. was not sent to the press, and it passed into the possession of Lord John Russell by the bequest of the late Lady Holland. Lord John has now given it to the world in the state in which it was

left by Lord Holland and Mr. Allen, but with the addition of some ably-written and judicious comments of his own. As the work consists of a substratum of original materials, illustrated by the independent annotations of three commentators, which are distinguished by certain typographical marks, it presents (as Lord John observes) 'a disjointed and irregular appearance.' It has the form of a collection of Fox manuscripts, with *variorum* notes. Nevertheless it contains so much authentic information, accompanied with criticism so intelligent and so candid, that no Englishman who desires to understand the history of his country between the years 1768 and 1792, can fail to read it with advantage and pleasure. Lord John, indeed, says of the work which he edits, 'that its greatest value will be found in the letters of Mr. Fox to Lord Holland, written between 1790 and 1805. *These letters are more literary than political, and show how keen was Mr. Fox's enjoyment of poetry, especially Greek and Italian.*' Of the series of letters thus described only a few appear in these volumes; but we think that Lord John scarcely does justice to the value of the documents and papers which he has already published; for many of them are highly important, and the period to which they relate comprises the most active and prominent portion of Fox's political life.*

The materials for the publication to which the name of the Duke of Buckingham is attached, are family papers which have been preserved at Stowe. There are some interesting letters written by Mr. Thomas Grenville when employed in diplomatic service on the Continent; but by far the most valuable portion of the work consists of the letters of Mr. William Grenville (afterwards Lord Grenville) to his elder brother, the Marquis of Buckingham. These letters were evidently written in the strictest confidence, without premeditation, and with no idea that they would ever be given to the public. For this reason they cannot fairly be compared with official or semi-official letters, which are composed in a guarded and reserved style. But, on account of their familiar and unstudied character, they afford the stronger evidence of the sagacity, judgment, and undeviating good temper of their distinguished author. The task of editing the valuable materials which he had extracted from his family archives, has been committed by the Duke of

* There exist two biographical accounts of Mr. Fox. One is intitled 'Memoirs of the Public Life of the late Right Honourable 'C. J. Fox,' by R. Fell, in 2 vols. 8vo. 1808. The other is 'Memoirs of the latter Years of the Right Honourable C. J. Fox,' by J. B. Trotter, Esq., late Private Secretary to Mr. Fox. 1 vol. 8vo. 1811. Neither work is at all satisfactory.

Buckingham to some person whose ignorance of the events and persons of the period, and whose consequent incapacity for the work, almost exceed belief. Most of the errors of this scandalously incompetent editor have been already pointed out by a contemporary*; but are nevertheless, with a few exceptions, faithfully reproduced in the new edition.† Before the con-

* Thus the strange blunder that the Marquis of Rockingham 'was succeeded in his title by his nephew, the Earl Fitzwilliam,' stands uncorrected in vol. i. p. 48. of the new and revised edition. Seeing that the present Earl Fitzwilliam is the son and immediate successor of the Earl Fitzwilliam who is supposed to have inherited the title of Rockingham, it might have occurred to the Editor to doubt the accuracy of his statement.

† Even after the rich harvest of blunders gathered in by the Quarterly Reviewer, a few still remain to be gleaned. Thus in vol. i. p. 185., Lord Grenville, in giving a rumoured list of the Coalition Cabinet, says, 'Lord Keppel to return. Query, whether he is by this means to be in the cabinet with Twitcher? I think he should appoint *St. Hugh* a Junior Lord.' By *Twitcher* is meant Lord Sandwich, who was supposed to have instigated the court-martial against Lord Keppel. *St. Hugh* is evidently a misprint for *Sir Hugh*: that is, Sir Hugh Palliser, whose bitter feud with Lord Keppel is well known. At the end of the letter, the quotation 'amicitiæ sempiternæ, inimiciæ placabilēs,' is used sarcastically in reference to Fox, who had cited the sentence in the House of Commons as a justification of the Coalition (17. Feb. 1783).

In vol. i. p. 372., the following passage occurs in one of Lord Grenville's letters:— 'We are a little uneasy on account of Tippoo, who had made peace with the Mahrattas, and was collecting his forces with a view of attacking the Nizam, or the Rajah of *Gravan-core*, whom we must protect, or the *Camatre* itself.' For *Gravan-core* read *Travancore*, and for *Camatre* read *Carnatic*.

Again in p. 416. 'You have never sent me any answer about the Cranbourne *chair* proposal, by which means that business is delayed; where for *chair* read *chase*.'

In vol. ii. p. 52., Wm. Gerard Hamilton is, by the interposition of a comma, divided into two persons, Gerard and Hamilton.

In vol. ii. p. 393., Lord Grenville writes on May 25. 1798, 'O'Connor's acquittal is imputed to *Miller's* charge, and *that* to his 'being completely exhausted, so as to omit some of the most material 'points in the evidence.' Who ever heard of Judge *Miller* at the end of the last century? The reference is to the celebrated case of O'Quigley, Arthur O'Connor, and three others, who were tried for treason at Maidstone, on May 21. and 22. 1798. The judge who summed up was Mr. Justice *Buller*; O'Quigley was convicted, and afterwards hanged; Arthur O'Connor, and the three others, were acquitted.

In the following sentence from a letter written by Lord Grenville,

tinuation of this work is published, we trust that an editor may be found who has heard of the duel between Pitt and Tierney, and who knows that Cuxhaven is not in Ireland.

Mr. Fox was first returned to the Parliament which met on the 10th of May, 1768, being then only nineteen years and four months old. He sat for the borough of Midhurst; his seat having, as it appears, been purchased by his father, Lord Holland. He came into Parliament as a supporter of the Government, of which the Duke of Grafton was then the head; and was, following his father's politics, an eager opponent of Wilkes. He began, even at the age of twenty, to show his remarkable powers of parliamentary debate; and some of his earliest speeches, as we learn from the unwilling testimony of Horace Walpole, produced a strong impression upon the House.* In February 1770—being in his twenty-first year—he accepted

in Nov. 1788, a negative appears to be wanting:—‘The party in general are so hungry and impatient, that I think they will [not?] act upon the better judgment of their leaders, and prevent them from doing anything which allows a moment's delay.’ (Vol. ii. p. 24.)

While the Editor details at length those well-known events which may be found in the ‘Annual Register,’ or any ordinary history of the time, he omits to explain those less obvious allusions on which a reader is most likely to desire explanation. Thus in vol. i. p. 258., Lord Grenville writes, on May 7. 1783:—‘I am in some doubt what to do about coming over to you, as on account of *the prince's death*, there is no levee to-day, nor, I fear, on Friday.’ The prince here alluded to is Prince Octavius, son of George III., who died on May 3. at Kew Palace, of inoculation for the small pox, aged four years.

In vol. ii. p. 63. ‘I was a little mortified at finding our friend Sir P. P. among them. Sir P. P. is Sir Peter Parker, as appears by a list in a subsequent page, p. 83.

Vol. ii. p. 139. ‘Pitt authorises me to say that he could find the means of opening a ten shilling government for him in England immediately.’ A ten shilling government is a small military command with a pay of ten shillings per diem.

Vol. ii. p. 377. In a letter of May 3. 1797, Lord Grenville says to Lord Buckingham, — ‘Have you seen *my Prince*? He is sensible and well-informed, though not exactly the picture of a young lover.’ The Prince alluded to is the Prince of Wirtemberg, who was married to the Princess Royal on May 13. 1797, and whose figure, of extraordinary obesity, was certainly not that of a young lover.

* Both Fox and Pitt showed their uncommon powers of parliamentary speaking from their earliest attempts. Sir R. Walpole, on the other hand, who for courage, readiness, and dexterity in debate, was afterwards second to none, failed in his first speech. See ‘Lord Mahon's History,’ vol. i. p. 265. Ed. 12mo.

the office of a Junior Lord of the Admiralty, shortly after the appointment of Lord North as First Minister, upon the resignation of the Duke of Grafton.* In the Session of 1772, Mr. Fox made a motion for the repeal of the Marriage Act; on which occasion Horace Walpole—a witness whose language must not always be construed strictly—gives the following account.

‘When he had moved this repeal, he had not read the Marriage Act, nor did he till some days after. A few evenings before he had been at Brompton on two errands; one, to consult Justice Fielding on the penal laws, the other to borrow 10,000*l.*, which he brought to town at the hazard of being robbed. As the gauning and extravagance of young men of quality had arrived now at a pitch never heard of, it is worth while to give some account of it. They had a club at Almack’s, in Pall Mall, where they played only for rouleaus of 50*l.* each, and generally there was 10,000*l.* in specie on the table. Lord Holland had paid above 20,000*l.* for his two sons. Nor were the manners of the gamesters, or even their dresses for play, undeserving notice. They began by pulling off their embroidered clothes and put on frieze great coats, or turned their coats inside outwards for luck. They put on pieces of leather (such as are worn by footmen when they clean the knives) to save their laced ruffles; and to guard their eyes from the light, and to prevent tumbling their hair, wore high-crowned straw hats with broad brims, and adorned with flowers and ribbons; masks to conceal their emotions when they played at quize. Each gamester had a small neat stand by him to hold their tea, or a wooden bowl with an edge of ormolu to hold their rouleaus. They borrowed great sums of Jews at exorbitant premiums. Charles Fox called his outward room, where those Jews waited till he rose, his Jerusalem Chamber.’ (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 70.)

On the 20th of February 1772, Fox, being then in his twenty-third year, resigned his seat at the Admiralty Board. His resignation was due, partly to some personal discontent with Lord North, but chiefly to his intention of opposing the Royal Marriage Act, a measure then in preparation, much desired by the King, but reluctantly adopted by his Ministers. While the Bill was pending in Parliament, the King wrote to Lord North in the following terms:—‘I expect every nerve to be strained to carry the Bill. It is not a question relating to administrations, *but personally to myself*; therefore I have a right to expect a hearty support from every one in my service, *and I shall remember defaulters.*’ It is evident from the King’s language that no person who voted against this Bill could

* The popular belief that Lord Bute continued to exercise a secret influence over the King, after his retirement from office, is, we may remark, conclusively refuted by the evidence adduced in vol. i. pp. 65—68. of the ‘*Memorials of Fox*.’

continue to hold office under the Crown. Fox took an active part in opposing it during its passage through the House of Commons. 'In the course of the debates (says Horace Walpole) I have given very inadequate ideas of the speeches of Burke, Charles Fox, and Wedderburne, three excellent orators in different ways. Burke's wit, allusions, and enthusiasm were striking, but not imposing; Wedderburne was a sharp, clever arguer, though unequal; Charles Fox, much younger than either, was universally allowed to have seized the just point of argument throughout with most amazing rapidity and clearness, and to have excelled even Charles Townshend as a Parliament man, though inferior in wit and variety of talents.'

Fox afterwards introduced his Bill for amending the Marriage Act: it was opposed by Lord North and by Burke, and was ultimately thrown out. Walpole's account of Burke's speech against this Bill is remarkable with reference to his subsequent career.

'Burke made a fine and long oration against the motion. Burke was certainly in his principles no moderate man; and when his party did not interfere, generally leaned to the more arbitrary side, as had appeared in the late debates on the Church, in which he had declared for the clergy. . . . He spoke with a choice and variety of language, a profusion of metaphors, and yet with a correction of diction that were surprising. His fault was copiousness above measure; and he dealt abundantly, too much, in establishing general positions. *Two-thirds of this oration resembled the beginning of a book on speculative doctrines, and yet argument was not the forte of it.*'

This first breach between Mr. Fox and Lord North was not of long duration; for in December of the same year 1772, an arrangement was made, by which the former returned to office and became a junior Lord of the Treasury. His habits of deep play, however, unhappily continued unbroken, and in order to pay his gaming debts, he actually incurred liabilities to the enormous amount of 140,000*l.*, which sum was discharged by his father from his own estate.* A strange story is likewise told by Horace

* The following curious account of the occurrences of this time given to Lord Holland in 1823, by Lord Egremont, is worthy of attention by all persons who are in the habit of high play. 'Lord Egremont was convinced,' he said, 'by reflection, aided by his subsequent experience of the world, that there was at that time some unfair confederacy among some of the players, and that the great losers, especially Mr. Fox, were actually duped and cheated; he should, he said, have been torn to pieces, and stoned by the

Walpole (the truth of which is recognised by Lord Holland) of his having been at this time duped by an impostor calling herself the *Hon. Mrs. Grieve*, who undertook to procure for him as wife, a Miss Phipps, recently arrived from the West Indies, with a fortune of 80,000*l*.

In the session of 1774, Mr. Fox, impatient of the restraints to which a member holding a subordinate office is subject, differed from Lord North and took an independent line with respect to the committal of Woodfall the printer for a breach of privilege. The King, who appears to have conceived a personal dislike to Fox on account of his opposition to the Royal Marriage Bill, was much displeased at his conduct on this occasion, and on February 15th, wrote thus to Lord North:—

‘I am greatly incensed at the presumption of Charles Fox in forcing you to vote with him last night, but approve much of the making your friends vote in the majority. Indeed, that young man has so strongly cast off every principle of common honour and honesty, that he must become as contemptible as he is odious. I hope you will let him know that you are not insensible of his conduct towards you.’*

On a subsequent stage of the same proceeding, Fox repeated his insubordination to Lord North, who, in consequence, sent him a laconic letter, informing him that he was no longer a Lord

‘losers themselves, for hinting such a thing at the time, and even now, those of them, himself excepted, who survived, would exclaim at such a supposition; but he was nevertheless satisfied, that the immoderate, constant, and unparalleled advantages over Charles Fox, and other young men, were not to be accounted for merely by the difference of passing or holding the box, or the hazard of the dice. He had indeed no suspicions (any more than the rest had) at the time, but he had thought it much over since, and he now had.’

* George III. commented very freely on the public men whom he disliked, in his letters to Lord North. Thus in a letter of Aug. 1775, he speaks of Lord Chatham’s recent political conduct as ‘abandoned’; he describes Lord Chatham as totally devoid of the honourable sentiment of gratitude, and calls him ‘a trumpet of sedition.’ (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 129.) In letters of the 16th of March, 1778, he speaks of ‘Lord Chatham and his crew;’ and calls him ‘that perfidious man.’ It seems to be ascertained that George III. had an attack of insanity (concealed from the public) so early as the year 1765. See ‘Adolphus’s Hist. of the Reign of Geo. III.’ vol. i. p. 175. ed. 1840; ‘Lord Mahon’s History,’ vol. v. p. 26. Nevertheless, the letters of Lord Grenville during the King’s illness in 1788–9 (in the Buckingham Papers), convince us that the Ministers had, at that time, no suspicion of his having been previously insane. See particularly a letter in vol. ii. p. 5.

of the Treasury. Fox now put an end to his connexion with Lord North, went into Opposition, and began to act with the Rockingham party, though he did not formally join it till 1778 or 9. By this means he became the friend of Burke; a friendship which exercised much influence upon him. His independent political career, after he had broken through his original party ties, may be considered as commencing from 1774, when he was in his 25th year. This year, as Lord John Russell remarks, in an excellent review of our history from 1763 to 1774 (vol. i. p. 102—133.) was the turning point of the American war. It was then that Lord North, though he had originally been adverse to the imposition of the tea duty, decided to maintain it, by closing the port of Boston, and altering the charter of Massachusetts. 'In taking this course,' says Lord John, 'Lord North was warmly supported in the closet, and received the sympathy of the country. Yet it is impossible not to reflect that Lord North was the same minister who in 1768 had, by his voice in the Cabinet, prevented the repeal of the tea duty, and the abandonment of all taxation by Parliament for imperial purposes.* Had he supported that repeal in 1768, he would have prevented the American war; in 1774 he at least would have given a chance to peace; in 1778, after our armies had been defeated, the concession was useless and insufficient.'

Fox, from the time that he separated himself from Lord North, carried on an unremitting opposition to the American war. His speeches, always marked by decided ability, had hitherto been desultory and occasional; but he now (as Gibbon said) discovered powers for regular debate, which neither his friends hoped, nor his enemies dreaded. Mr. Grattan (as we learn from Lord John), who had heard Mr. Fox at various epochs, declared his preference for the speeches delivered during the American war, to all the other efforts of his eloquence. His denunciations of Ministers and their policy were conveyed in the strongest language. Thus in 1777 he described Lord G. Germaine, as

* The division in the Cabinet of 5 to 4, by which it was decided to maintain the tea duty, was not in 1768, but on the 1st of May, 1769. See Lord 'Mahon's History,' vol. v. p. 242, and Ap. p. xxxvii. The votes were as follows:—

<i>For repeal.</i>	<i>Against it.</i>
Duke of Grafton.	Lord President.
Lord Chancellor Camden.	Lord North.
Lord Granby.	Lord Rochford.
Gen. Conway.	Lord Hillsborough.
	Lord Weymouth.

On such slight circumstances do great events sometimes turn.

‘that inauspicious and ill-omened character, whose arrogance and ‘presumption, whose ignorance and inability,’ had brought evil upon the country.* Horace Walpole says, that on the budget in 1778, ‘Charles Fox poured out the bitterest and one of the ‘finest of all his philippics against Lord North, taxing him with ‘breach of honour in having declared that he would resign if ‘his first conciliatory proposition had not the desired effect; ‘that he had broken his word, that he had this year brought ‘measures of the same kind, at which he confessed he felt ‘humbled, though not ashamed; if such measures did not make ‘him blush, what would? And in this style he spoke for above ‘half an hour.’

The following curious account of a scene in an American debate in 1777 occurs in a letter of Mr. Crawford (better known by his prenomens of *Fish*) to Lord Ossory: —

‘Charles [Fox] spoke with great violence, but the House this time went along with him. We were not shocked at his talking of bringing Lord George [Germaine] to a *second* trial, nor were we shocked at being asked if we could patiently continue to submit to see this nation disgraced by him in *every* capacity.† There were high words between Wedderburne and Burke, which so offended the latter that he went out of the House, and, I believe, intended to challenge Wedderburne, but was prevented by a letter from Wedderburne, and an explanation likewise, which he sent him through Charles. In the midst of Wedderburne’s speaking, Burke burst into one of his loud hysterical laughs. Unfortunately at that moment there was a dead silence in the House. Wedderburne, in a very angry tone, said, that if that gentleman did not know manners, he, as an individual, would teach them to him; that he had not the good will of that gentleman, and did not wish for it, but he was ambitious of having even his respect, and would force it from him, &c. This the other construed into a menace. . . . I have given this imperfect description of a quarrel, which is very well settled on both sides. Burke was origi-

* On this occasion ‘Lord North handsomely defended Lord George, and said he was glad Fox had abandoned him, an old hulk, ‘to attack a man of war; but afterwards he perhaps hurt Lord George ‘as much as Fox had done, for the latter coming up to the Treasury ‘benches, Lord North said, in Lord George’s hearing, “Charles, I am “glad you did not fall on me to-day, for you was in full feather.”’ (*Memoirs of Fox*, vol. i. p. 159.) This anecdote proves the private familiarity which still subsisted between Lord North and Fox, notwithstanding their political differences.

† The allusion is to Lord G. Germaine’s conduct at the battle of Minden, in 1759, for which he was dismissed by Mr. Pitt from all his military employments, and was declared by a court-martial to have been guilty of disobeying orders, and to be unfit to serve his Majesty in any military capacity whatever.

nally in the wrong, because nothing could be more uncivil than his laugh appeared to be, from the accident of the dead silence of the House at that moment.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 162.)

The efforts of the Opposition in denouncing the policy of Lord North's Government were not unavailing, for in a letter to Lord Ossory of November 29. 1777, Fox says, 'I am clear the opinion of the majority of the House is with us. I cannot help flattering myself that opinions will, in the long run, have their influence on votes.' A few months later (February, 1778) he uses the following remarkable expressions respecting himself in a letter to his intimate friend Fitzpatrick, who was then in America:—

'I think I have given you enough of politics, considering I have nothing but reports and conjectures to give you. With respect to my own share, I can only say that people flatter me that I continue to gain, rather than lose, my credit as an orator; and I am so convinced that this is all that I ever shall gain (unless I choose to become the meanest of men) that I never think of any other object of ambition. I am certainly ambitious by nature, but I really have, or think I have, totally subdued that passion. I have still as much vanity as ever, which is a happier passion by far; because great reputation I think I may acquire and keep, great situation I never can acquire nor, if acquired, keep, without making sacrifices that I never will make. If I am wrong, and more sanguine people right, *tant mieux*, and I shall be as happy as they can be; but if I am right, I am sure I shall be the happier, for having made up my mind to my situation.'

The influence, however, which Fox had gained in the House by his speeches against the Ministry, and the waning popularity of the war since the reverses of our arms, especially after the surrender of Saratoga in October 1777, led to a negotiation with Fox in March 1778, to induce him to join Lord North's Ministry. This negotiation (to which the King's consent had doubtless been obtained) was conducted by Mr. Eden (afterwards Lord Auckland), whose account of his interview of three hours with Fox is now published. Fox is reported to have said, 'that except with Lord G. Germaine, he could act with the existing Ministers; but he disavowed every possibility of accepting singly and alone, and even doubted whether he could accept in any case.' 'I am convinced,' adds Mr. Eden, 'that he will make no bad use of the conversation, but in other respects will be as hostile as ever.' A similar overture was made at the same time, through Mr. Eden, to Lord Shelburne, whose chief political connexion was with Lord Chatham; and through him an attempt was made to ascertain the terms upon which Lord Chatham would join the Government. It is, how-

ever, evident that the King did not meditate any fundamental change of policy, or any real concession to the views of the Opposition. He was ready to engraft men of ability into the Ministry, but merely with a view of strengthening it, not of altering its measures. This appears clearly from a curious passage in Mr. Eden's account of his interview with Lord Shelburne. In the course of a discussion on certain changes of office, Lord Shelburne had made the remark, that 'surely there would be some mode of doing everything right, without doing anything harsh.'

'This,' says Mr. Eden, 'gave me the opening I wished, to enter fully, and in the plainest language, into the narrowness, nonsense, and harshness of the whole proposition, so far as implied a wish and expectation in his lordship's friend at Hayes [Lord Chatham] to avail himself of the pressure of a moment in order to dictate terms to the closet, every part of which would imply a desertion and disavowal of servants who for many years had fought the cause of their master, of the Parliament, and of the whole nation, with the most cordial fidelity and zeal; and this, too, upon principles of the purest kind, the truth of which remains unimpaired, though mischances and circumstances may make it more difficult to enforce them. I added, that though uninformed and unauthorised as to any specific resolutions taken, I could argue safely from the sentiments of honour which I knew to be firmly rooted, and could at once say that no arrangement could or would ever be listened to one moment except on the ground of mere accession of capacity and business, in a moment which would require great exertions, and that even such accessions could not be taken, unless made in a plan consistent with the honour of all that had passed heretofore.' (Vol. i. p. 185.)*

The limited extent of the King's views in consenting to these negotiations, and his resolution to continue the anti-American policy, so long as he could find Ministers who would support him, are fully displayed in his letters to Lord North at this period. In a letter of the 16th of March, 1778, he thus expresses himself: 'I will only add, to put before your eyes my

* Concerning this negotiation through Lord Shelburne with Lord Chatham, see 'Lord Mahon's History,' c. 57. vol. vi. p. 223—226. Lord Mahon remarks:—'It is certain that the object of the King was at this juncture wholly unattainable, that if Lord North retired as not willing or not able to carry his system further, no other administration on the same system could be formed.' This opinion seems to us perfectly correct, but the plan of a coalition can hardly be called 'the King's object.' It was the King's aversion; and he was only willing to consent to it on terms which rendered it impossible.

'most inward thoughts, that no advantage to this country, nor personal danger to myself, can ever make me address myself to Lord Chatham, or any other branch of Opposition. Honestly, I would rather lose the crown I now wear than bear the ignominy of possessing it under their shackles.' On the following day he writes thus: 'My dear Lord, no consideration in life shall make me stoop to Opposition. I am still ready to accept any part of them that will come to the assistance of my present efficient Ministers; but whilst any ten men in the kingdom will stand by me, I will not give myself up to bondage. My dear Lord, I will rather risk my crown than do what I think personally disgraceful. It is impossible this nation should not stand by me. If they will not, they shall have another king; for I never will put my hand to what will make me miserable to the last hour of my life.' On the 22nd, the King says: 'I will never consent to removing the members of the present Cabinet from my service;' and on the 29th he puts this question to Lord North: 'Do you think it possible to strengthen the present Administration by an accession of some men of talents from the Opposition?' He then adds: 'If that cannot be effected, will you consent to continue, and try to exert yourself, and co-operate with me in putting vigour and activity to every department.' Again, on the 29th of January, 1779, the King addresses Lord North in the same strain: 'I perceive, as I expected, that Opposition, when they talk of conditions, mean to dictate. I thank God, whatever difficulties may surround me, I am not made of materials to stoop to that.' And on the 4th February: 'My conduct will show that I never am deaf to any apparent proposals of general union, though no circumstances shall ever compel me to be dictated to by Opposition.'

If George III. had understood his position as a constitutional king, he would at this time have consented to form a new Ministry from the leaders of Opposition, and have acquiesced, without querulous and undignified protestations, in a policy which in a few years was forced upon his acceptance by the general feeling of the country, and at the point of the Parliamentary bayonet.

Lord Holland remarks upon these declarations, that 'the King was willing to employ any one who would concur with him in his efforts to reduce the revolted colonies to obedience, but would not accept the services of Opposition, because the Opposition thought that object unattainable, and were ready to acknowledge the independence of the United States. The result is, that it was the King at that period, and the King

‘only, who prevented a coalition of parties, and peace with ‘America.’ From this view Lord J. Russell justly, as we think, dissents: ‘I cannot,’ he says, ‘concur in this last remark. ‘The King’s determination to carry on the war in all quarters ‘of the globe could have had no practical influence had not ‘Lord North consented to remain Minister, to carry on a war ‘of which he disapproved, and had not a majority of the House ‘of Commons supported a system which they believed in their ‘hearts to be fraught with danger to the country. The power ‘of a single will was indeed conspicuous; but the Constitution ‘afforded ample means of overruling that will, had the Minister ‘obeyed his own convictions, or had the House of Commons ‘been true to the people they represented.’

In the summer of 1779, fresh overtures to the leaders of Opposition were made for the formation of a Coalition Government, in which Lord Weymouth was to be First Lord of the Treasury, and Thurlow Chancellor; Lords North, G. Germaine, Suffolk, Sandwich, Dartmouth, and some others, were to retire, and their places were to be filled up by Lord Rockingham and his friends, or they were to take in the Duke of Grafton, and Lords Camden and Shelburne. This overture was rejected by Lord Rockingham’s party, somewhat too hastily and peremptorily, in Mr. Fox’s judgment: ‘You think,’ wrote Mr. Fox to Lord Rockingham, shortly afterwards, ‘you can ‘best serve the country by continuing a fruitless opposition; ‘*I think it impossible to serve it at all but by coming into power*; ‘and go even so far as to think it irreconcilable with the duty ‘of a public man to refuse it, if offered to him in a manner ‘consistent with his private honour, and so as to enable him to ‘form fair hopes of doing essential service.’ The wisdom of this refusal is most ably vindicated in an admirable letter from the Duke of Richmond to Mr. Fox, which its length prevents us from extracting, but which we strongly commend to the reader’s attentive perusal. (Vol. i. p. 213.) The Duke of Richmond shows that the offer was too vague for acceptance; and that the Whigs, who might have joined the Government, would have had no security that their principles would be acted on. ‘If,’ he says, ‘we are not to make the arrangement, and ‘are yet to be supposed to have the management of affairs, it ‘becomes surely not only fair, but necessary, that we should ‘have a specific description of that share of Government proposed for us, which is to give us the means, weight, and ‘authority to carry our measures; or if it is not intended that ‘we are to direct the measures, it is necessary we should have ‘a precise idea of those to which we are called to accede.

'Without one of these, it is merely an offer of places without power, under a bargain to screen those whom we have been so long condemning. Such an offer I am sure you will approve of our rejecting with indignation.' It is evident, from what we now know of the King's feelings, that if Lord Rockingham and his friends had met this overture with a less decided refusal at the threshold, and had shown a willingness to entertain the proposal, they would speedily have found that the King was only willing to admit them on terms inconsistent with their principles and personal honour, and that the negotiation would have immediately come to an end. Thus far we assent to the view so well enforced in the Duke of Richmond's letter; at the same time we think, with Fox, that it was a most important matter for the interests of the country at that moment to break up Lord North's Government, which object would have been accomplished, if several of the Whig leaders could have been introduced into the Cabinet without compromising their principles; and although we do not believe that the King would have allowed an Administration so constituted to remain in power for six months, we deem it highly improbable that, in the existing state of public affairs, he would have been able to resuscitate as bad a Government as that which continued in Office until 1782.

In the summer of 1780, soon after Lord G. Gordon's riots, overtures for a junction were again made to Lord Rockingham through Mr. Frederic Montague.* In a memorandum of instructions for this negotiation, found among Lord North's papers, it is stated: 'No difficulty about Dukes of Portland and Manchester, Mr. Townshend, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Fox; but Lord [North] advises that Mr. Fox should at first be proposed for an office that would not lead immediately to the closet.' The leaders of Opposition entertained this proposal, and offered to treat upon certain conditions, of which the two following were the most important.

'1. The American war requires no discussion, as they did not see how the troops could be recalled from thence, and the dependence of America need not at present be taken into consideration.'

'2. That some public measures must be admitted to enable them to coalesce with reputation, such as Mr. Crewe's Bill,

* Mr. Frederic Montague, of Papplewick Hall, in Nottinghamshire, sat for Northampton, and afterwards for Higham Ferrers. He was a prominent member of the Rockingham party, and was one of the seven commissioners named in Fox's India Bill.

‘ the Contractors’ Bill, and a part, if not the whole, of Mr. Burke’s Bill.’

As soon, however, as the King was made aware of these conditions, the negotiation received its *quietus* from the following remarks addressed by His Majesty, in his own royal style of composition, to Lord North:—

‘ The evasive answer about America will by no means answer. Indeed, upon all constitutional points, the Opposition have run so wild, that it is absolutely necessary for those who come into office to give assurances that they do not mean to be hampered by the tenets they have held during their opposition. The second proposition is therefore quite inadmissible.

‘ The Duke of Richmond and Mr. Fox have, more avowedly than any others of the Rockingham party, dipped themselves, for they have added, shortening the duration of Parliaments, and the former, by a strange conceit of changing the whole mode and right of election, would materially alter the Constitution. This, added to his unremitted personal ill conduct to me, it cannot be expected that I should express any wish of seeing him in my service. *Persons must atone for their faults before I can attempt to forgive them.* The Duke of Richmond has not put his foot into my apartments for seven years, but not content with this, sent me a message by Lord Weymouth, that though he never came near to me, he, as a Lieutenant-General, asked my leave to go to France. As to Mr. Fox, if any lucrative, not ministerial office, can be pointed out for him, provided he will support the Ministry, I shall have no objection to the proposition. He never had any principle, and can therefore act as his interest may guide him.

‘ The Duke of Portland I should with pleasure see in my service. Ireland, or any great Court office, would, I hope, suit him. The Duke of Manchester, in a lucrative office, I should not object to. Messrs. Townshend and Burke would be real acquisitions.’ (Vol. i. p. 252.)

During all this time, Lord North was secretly disinclined to the policy on which his Government had been acting; he was desirous of resigning his post of Prime Minister, and only retained it in deference to the King’s wishes. Ample evidence of this fact is furnished in the work before us. The following extract, from a letter of Lord North to the King, contains a most extraordinary confession of the state of his mind on the subject. The conversation took place in October 1779; and Lord North remained in office more than two years longer.

‘ Lord Gower [President of the Council] came to Lord North to inform him that he had long felt the utmost uneasiness at the situation of his Majesty’s affairs; that nothing can be so weak as the Government; that nothing is done; that there was no discipline in the state, the army, or the navy; and that impending ruin must be

the consequence of the present system of government; that he thought himself obliged, as well in conscience as in wisdom, to desire an immediate dismissal from his employment; that he had no connexion with any of the members of the Opposition, which he thought as wicked as the Administration is weak; that nothing can afford the least hope but a coalition, and he is afraid that even that remedy may be too late; that he feels the greatest gratitude for the many marks of royal goodness which he has received, but that he does not think it the duty of a faithful servant to endeavour to preserve a system which must end in the ruin of his Majesty and of the country. He is determined never again to take office, but to support Government in his private capacity. Lord North thinks that Lord Gower's resignation at the present moment must be the ruin of Administration. In Lord North's arguments with Lord Gower, Lord North owns that he had certainly one disadvantage, *which is that he holds in his heart, and has held for these three years, just the same opinion with Lord Gower.* (Vol. i. p. 245.)

In commenting on this remarkable declaration, Lord Holland and Mr. Allen 'lament Lord North's weakness, but enter into 'the chivalrous feelings of Lord North, which induced him, in 'opposition to his better judgment, not to abandon a master 'who expressed for him such confidence, affection, and regard.' From this opinion Lord John Russell dissents, and supports his dissent by the following just and discriminating remarks: —

'The King held that the acknowledgment of the independence of America would place this country in a state of inferiority, and be tantamount to its ruin as a great and powerful state. Lord Chatham had held an opinion very similar to this.' Lord Shelburne, following his leader, said in the House of Lords, that when America became independent, the sun of England would set. *The sovereign was only blameable for the obstinacy with which he clung to an opinion entertained by some of the most sagacious and eminent of his subjects.* Lord North's position was different; he was disposed to conciliate America, had sent commissioners for that purpose, and was quite ready to consent to peace. For three years he had been of opinion that his own ministry was feeble, and would effect no good purpose. Why, then, did he remain? *To carry into effect the personal wishes of the sovereign, which he preferred to the welfare of the State.* This may be Toryism; but it is not patriotic, still less is it constitutional, conduct.' (Vol. i. p. 247.)

As the war proceeded, and its failures accumulated; moreover, as the ability with which its management was attacked by the Opposition, and the weakness with which it was defended by Ministers, became more conspicuous, a change in public opinion was gradually produced, which began to be felt in the votes of the House of Commons. The first decided symptom of this change was the result of the famous motion of

Dunning—‘That the influence of the Crown has increased, is ‘increasing, and ought to be diminished’—which, after a hot debate, was carried, on the 6th of April, 1780, by 233 to 215 votes. In the mean time, the pretensions of the Opposition, and their indisposition to such a compromise as they had recently been willing to accept, naturally increased. In writing to his friend Fitzpatrick, in September, 1781, Mr. Fox says:—‘The ‘more I think of the whole of the business, the more I feel ‘averse to coming in upon any terms, unless on those of parliamentary condemnation of what is past.’ Nothing of this sort was hinted at in the negotiation, through Mr. Fred. Montague, in the summer of the previous year. A few days before the fall of Lord North’s Ministry, Fox used language in the House of Commons which showed that he kept no measures with the Court. In the debate on General Conway’s motion for peace with America, on February 22. 1782, Weibore Ellis, the new American Secretary, made an unmeaning speech, which disclosed no decided views. ‘Jenkinson,’ says Horace Walpole, ‘was less oracular, and Charles Fox accordingly applied a much ‘harsher comment on him, as one who was the mouth of the ‘oracle, of which Ellis was only the statue: but as if Fox had ‘embraced all the notions that had been held about oracles (to ‘which indeed he did not even allude), he mentioned the *infernal* ‘*spirit* that really ruled and had nearly ruined the country.’ But notwithstanding the increasing confidence of the Opposition, the King persisted, as long as he could keep a Ministry together, in refusing his consent to the independence of the revolted colonies. Thus even on the 26th of December, 1781, he is careful to impress on Lord North that there is ‘no change ‘in his sentiments on the essential point, namely, the getting ‘a peace at the expense of a separation from America, which no ‘difficulties can get him to consent to.’ Even when the overthrow of Lord North’s Ministry, by adverse votes of the House of Commons, was imminent, the King still held to his intention of excluding the Opposition from power. ‘Certain it is,’ says Walpole, ‘nothing could exceed the aversion of the King, not ‘to parting with his minister, but to accepting one by force. ‘All his arts,—little ones, indeed,—were employed to avoid ‘that humiliation; and though he succeeded in the only artifice ‘in which he ever had succeeded—sowing division, yet he not ‘only avoided no mortification, but laid a foundation for receiving ‘much greater.’ He even talked of returning to Hanover, and directions were given to prepare the royal yacht for his transport to the Continent. This intention seems to have been in

his mind when, on the 17th of March, three days before Lord North's resignation, he addressed to his Prime Minister the following mysterious words:—"I am resolved not to throw myself into the hands of Opposition, at all events, and shall certainly, if things go as they seem to tend, know what my conscience as well as honour dictates, *as the only way left for me.*"

Lord North's resignation, involving the dissolution of his Ministry, and the pacification with America, took place on the 20th of March, 1782. The following lively account of the scene which passed that night in the House of Commons is left by Lord Holland:—

"I have heard my uncle Fitzpatrick give a very diverting account of the scene that passed in the House of Commons on the day of Lord North's resignation, which happened to be a remarkable cold day, with a fall of snow. A motion of Lord Surrey's, for the dismissal of Ministers, stood for that day, and the Whigs were anxious that it should come on before the resignation of Lord North was officially announced, that his removal from office might be more manifestly and formally the act of the House of Commons. He and Lord Surrey rose at the same instant; after much clamour, disorder, and some insignificant speeches on order, Mr. Fox, with great quickness and address, moved, as the most regular method of extricating the House from its embarrassment, "That Lord Surrey be now heard." But Lord North, with yet more admirable presence of mind, mixed with pleasantry, rose immediately and said, "I rise to speak to that motion;" and, as his reason for opposing it, stated his resignation and the dissolution of the Ministry. The House, satisfied, became impatient, and after some ineffectual efforts of speakers on both sides to procure a hearing, an adjournment took place. Snow was falling, and the night tremendous. All the members' carriages were dismissed, and Mrs. Bennet's room at the door was crowded. But Lord North's carriage was waiting. He put into it one or two of his friends, whom he had invited to go home with him, and turning to the crowd, chiefly composed of his bitter enemies, in the midst of their triumph, exclaimed, in this hour of defeat and supposed mortification, with admirable good humour and pleasantry, "I have my carriage. You see, gentlemen, the advantage of being in the secret. Good night." (Vol. i. p. 295.)*

The history of the formation of the new Ministry is not a little remarkable, and clearly explains its internal feebleness and speedy extinction. The King began by applying, through the Chancellor Thurlow, to Lord Rockingham, as leader of the principal section of the Whigs, in order to learn the terms upon

* The same story is told in Wraxall's 'Historical Memoirs,' vol. ii. p. 607, ed. 1836.

which he would undertake to form an administration.* These were, in substance, the independence of America, and measures for diminishing the influence of the Crown. Unwilling to capitulate on these terms, the King next made an attempt to induce Lord Gower to undertake the formation of a government; but without success. In his letter authorising this application, he declared that 'he could never submit to a total change without 'abandoning his principles and honour, which he would never 'do.' The King then sent for Lord Shelburne, and asked him to form a government; he declined the offer, and advised the King to prefer Lord Rockingham†: a fact which he did not then disclose, but which he stated in the House of Lords after Lord Rockingham's death‡, and which was also mentioned at the same time by the King to Mr. Fox.§ In the first interview nothing was arranged, but three days afterwards the King sent again for Lord Shelburne, who returned, bringing an offer of the Treasury to Lord Rockingham, and full powers to treat, both as to men and measures; he himself was to be a Secretary of State. Lord Rockingham at first hesitated as to the propriety of accepting an offer made in so indirect and mistrustful a manner; but upon consultation with Mr. Fox and other friends, he decided (perhaps unwisely||) not to reject it. He accom-

* The particulars of this negotiation through Lord Thurlow, are given in Lord Albemarle's 'Memoirs of Lord Rockingham,' vol. ii.

† Lord Mahon, vol. vi. p. 397., gives the following extract from the Duke of Grafton's Memoirs respecting the failure of the negotiation with the Opposition in 1779, already mentioned:—'This circumstance cemented the Opposition into a more solid body, and 'furnished the means, that Lord Camden and I improved, by persuading Lord Shelburne not to contest with Lord Rockingham the 'Treasury, in case a new administration was to be formed. Lord 'Shelburne yielded the point with a better grace than I had expected.'

‡ July 10. 1782.

§ Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 436. Bishop Watson, in the anecdotes of his Life, says:—'Lord Rockingham told me that Lord 'Shelburne had behaved very honourably to him in not accepting the 'Treasury, which the King had offered to him in preference to Lord 'Rockingham.' (P. 93. 4to.)

|| After the resignation of the Shelburne Administration, the King applied to Lord North, who declined to undertake the formation of a Ministry himself, and advised the King to apply to the Duke of Portland. 'Lord North,' says H. Walpole, 'proposed to the King to see 'the Duke of Portland himself; but that the King refused, and told 'Lord North to desire the Duke to send him his arrangement in 'writing. This was as positively refused by the Duke, who sent

panied his acceptance, however, with a list of the Cabinet, in which he was himself First Lord of the Treasury, and Mr. Fox and Lord Shelburne the Secretaries of State. The office of Chancellor was alone left open. On the same evening a large meeting of members of the House of Commons was held at the house of Mr. T. Townshend, to which this list was submitted. The list, having been approved by this meeting, was sent to Lord Shelburne, who agreed to the arrangement, and communicated the names to the King. Lord Shelburne had a long interview with the King on the following day, and then went to Mr. Fox to inform him that the proposals were substantially adopted. At this interview Mr. Fox told Lord Shelburne that he perceived this Administration was to consist of two parts,—one belonging to the King, the other to the public. Lord Thurlow continued as Chancellor, and Mr. Dunning, created Lord Ashburton, was added to the Cabinet, upon the suggestion of Lord Shelburne, without previous communication with Lord Rockingham.

It thus appears that the King, though he prudently yielded to the pressure of a parliamentary majority, and abandoned his intention of retiring to Hanover, yet bowed his neck under the yoke of Opposition with visible reluctance. He refused to see his future Prime Minister until he was actually in office; and by giving his chief apparent confidence to another member of the Cabinet, he laid the foundation of discord and distrust in the Government from its very commencement. The seed thus carefully sown began soon to germinate. Even as early as the 28th of April—about a month after the formation of the Government—Mr. Fox writes as follows to Fitzpatrick:—

‘Shelburne shows himself more and more every day; is ridiculously jealous of my encroaching on his department, and wishes very much to encroach upon mine. He hardly liked my having a letter from Grattan, or my having written one to Lord Charlemont.* He affects the Minister more and more every day, and is, I believe, perfectly confident that the King intends to make him so. Provided we can stay in long enough to have given a good stout blow to the in-

‘word that if his Majesty condescended to employ him, it would be ‘necessary for him to see his Majesty.’ (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 49.) It ended by the King seeing the Duke of Portland, and his becoming Prime Minister. The above account is confirmed by Lord Grenville’s relation of his interview with the King, who showed him the correspondence with Lord North and the Duke of Portland. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 213.)

* As Lord Shelburne was Home Secretary, the Irish business was in his department.

fluence of the Crown, I do not think it much signifies how soon we go out after, and leave him and the Chancellor to make such a government as they can; and this I think we shall be able to do.' (Vol. i. p. 316.)

The practical working of our Government has undergone so great a change since 1780, notwithstanding the preservation of its forms, that it is important not to misunderstand the true character of the struggle which was terminated by the overthrow of Lord North's Ministry. It was a struggle of the King's personal will, supported by the influence of the Crown, against the independent portion of the House of Commons. The war against the insurgent colonies had at first been highly popular*; but a succession of disasters turned the tide of public feeling, and the country were ready to adopt the views of all the ablest men in both Houses of Parliament, who recommended either large concessions, or entire independence. But the King remained unmoved: he would not consent to a dismemberment of the Empire; and he found in Lord North and his colleagues Ministers who were ready to persist in the policy to which he adhered, even when it was contrary to their own convictions. Against this Ministry, Fox, Burke, and other powerful speakers, thundered night after night, denouncing their principles, conduct, motives, and capacity in the most vehement language, and sometimes directing their fire over the Treasury Bench at the Throne. When the battle was over, Fox openly treated it as a victory of the House of Commons over the King. On the night when Lord North announced his resignation, he said, that 'as the House had now proved their abhorrence of a Government of influence, the new Ministers must ever bear in mind that fact, and remember that to the House they owed their situations.' Moreover, before the list of the proposed Cabinet was presented to the King, it had been submitted to a meeting of the Whig party, and had received their sanction. By placing the question on this issue, George III. abandoned the secure, dignified, and neutral position of a constitutional king, and entered upon the perilous career of a party-leader. He protested against changing his principles, threw out obscure threats of abdicating the throne, and staked his political reputation against Fox and the leaders of Opposition. The result was, that he underwent the humiliation of a personal defeat; but he had sufficient prudence to tolerate for a time a Ministry composed of men whom he regarded as his personal enemies,

* See Lord Mahon, vol. vi. p. 68.

rather than attempt some act of unconstitutional violence, or bring the machine of Government to a stand-still.

The Rockingham Ministry lasted just three months. Lord North resigned on the 20th of March. Lord Rockingham died on the 1st of July.* Two days after his death, Mr. Fox advised the King to appoint as his successor some member of the Rockingham party. The King announced his intention of preferring Lord Shelburne, to whom Fox objected; but the King adhered to his resolution, and Fox, followed by Lord John Cavendish, with Burke, Sheridan, and others not in the Cabinet, resigned. Lord Shelburne then became Prime Minister, with Pitt as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons. Lord Keppel, General Conway, and the Duke of Richmond, the other three members of the Rockingham party in the Cabinet, retained their offices, and did not go out with Fox.

Among the Rockingham Whigs, the Duke of Richmond considered himself as having the first claim to the post of Prime Minister. He was, however, rejected by his friends on account of his extreme opinions on Parliamentary Reform; and Mr. Fox, as being his kinsman†, was employed to impart to him the unwelcome intelligence, which he executed thus: 'We must (he said) settle without delay whom to propose as the successor of Lord Rockingham; and as *you and I* are both out of the question, owing to the decided part we have taken about Parliamentary Reform, I think the Duke of Portland should be the man.' The Duke of Portland was, however, chiefly recommended for this post by his rank and respectable character; and in point of capacity and fitness for the office of Prime Minister, he was decidedly inferior to Lord Shelburne.

We have been the more particular in describing this change of Administration, because we believe that Fox's decision to separate himself from Lord Shelburne was the turning point of his political life, and exercised an enormous influence upon the subsequent course of events. His motive for this decision was his distrust of Lord Shelburne, whom he believed to be systematically insincere, and whom he likewise suspected of intriguing with the King against his colleagues. This suspicion

* The King (says Horace Walpole) showed his aversion to Lord Rockingham so indecently and unfeelingly, that, though he had accepted him for his Minister, he did not once send to inquire how the Marquis did when he was dying.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 440.)

† Mr. Fox was the nephew of the Duke of Richmond. His mother was the Duke's sister. The present Duke of Richmond is the great nephew of the Duke in question.

partly rested upon Lord Shelburne's general character, who had, so early as the year 1767, obtained from the writer of Junius the nickname of 'Malagrida,' on account of his supposed Jesuitical habits of mind.* Its chief ground, however, was Lord Shelburne's recent conduct in the negotiation for peace with America, the details of which we will proceed to narrate.†

The Secretary of State's office was formerly divided into the Northern and Southern Departments. The Southern Secretary had the management of home affairs, and of the correspondence with Ireland, the Colonies, and the States of Western Europe. The Northern Secretary conducted only the correspondence with the other European countries. This unequal and inconvenient division was discontinued upon the accession of the Rockingham Ministry, when the third or American Secretary was abolished, and the existing division of the Home and Foreign Departments was introduced.‡ The Home Office was formed out of the old Southern Department, and it therefore retained the Irish and Colonial business: the Foreign Office was formed out of the Northern Department, by the addition of

* It was given him in some anonymous productions by the author of Junius, which appeared under another signature. (See 'Woodfall's Junius,' vol. ii. pp. 472. 482.) Gabriel Malagrida, an Italian by birth, and a Jesuit, resided in Portugal. He was accused of participation in a conspiracy against the King, and was burnt by the Inquisition for heresy in 1761. He seems to have been scarcely sane. (Biogr. Un. and Chalmers, in v., and see Lord Mahon, vol. iv. p. 263.)

† Fox's resignation, says Lord Holland, was not the result of advice or persuasion. 'It was his own resolution adopted after much reflection, and founded on a general conviction that he could not conduct the public affairs under Lord Shelburne's treasury with safety, honour, or advantage; and from resentment at the duplicity with which his negotiations at Paris had been impeded by Lord Shelburne through Mr. Oswald, of which he thought Mr. Grenville's letters furnished him indubitable evidence.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 473. See some similar remarks of Lord Holland, *ib.* p. 387.)

‡ We have mentioned in a former Number that Lord Holland and Mr. Allen are mistaken in supposing that the division of the Northern and Southern departments subsisted at this time. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. pp. 345. 475.) If Lord Shelburne had had the old Southern department both negotiations would have been in his hands; for both France and the Colonies were in that department. Lord Shelburne's letter to Mr. Grenville, of July 5. 1782, begins thus:—'His Majesty having thought proper to entrust me with the seals of the Foreign Department, upon the resignation of Mr. Secretary Fox, I take the earliest opportunity of notifying it to you.' (S. P. O.) The seals of this department were immediately afterwards transferred to Lord Grantham.

the correspondence with those foreign countries which had previously been under the charge of the Southern Secretary. The Home Secretary, as the successor of the Southern Secretary, retained the seniority in official rank.

In the beginning of the year 1782, Franklin, who had been appointed one of the American Commissioners for negotiating with France, was staying at Paris. At the time when Lord North's Ministry was about to expire, Lord Cholmondeley passed through Paris on his road to England, and called upon Franklin, though previously unacquainted with him. During his visit, he offered to carry a letter from him to Lord Shelburne; and Franklin accordingly wrote to Lord Shelburne a letter of civility, in which he referred to their former acquaintance, and took occasion to express a hope that the recent votes of the House of Commons might lead to a general peace. This letter was written in ignorance of Lord North's resignation, the news of which reached Paris immediately afterwards. When Lord Shelburne received this letter, he already held the seals of the Home Department; and as the American colonies were still considered as subject to the Crown of England, all affairs relating to them were under his official cognisance. Without delay, he took advantage of this accident to send Mr. Oswald, a London merchant, formerly resident in America, to Paris, in order to communicate with Franklin. Oswald accordingly arrived in Paris near the beginning of April, and had an interview with Franklin, at which he delivered to him private letters from Lord Shelburne, and Mr. Laurens, an American officer, then a prisoner in England.* Franklin, in his detailed journal of these transactions, states that Oswald, at this interview, described England as ready to concede the independence of America, and to treat of peace, but as prepared to continue the war if the terms insisted on by France were too humiliating. The answer made by Franklin was, that he could only treat in concert with France; but he offered to introduce Oswald to M. de Vergennes, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, and an interview accordingly took place between them, a few days afterwards, in Franklin's presence. Oswald was unable to speak French, and the conversation was carried on through an interpreter. The general effect of this interview is related in a letter addressed by Franklin to Lord Shelburne. The principal points were, that France could not treat without her allies, and that Paris was suggested as the proper place for the

* See Franklin's Works by Sparks, vol. ix. p. 240., where the letters are printed.

negotiations. Oswald returned to London to carry the account of his interviews; bearing likewise the expression of Franklin's wish, that there might be no other channel of communication between him and the English Government than Oswald himself. Franklin, as Mr. Allen remarks, had doubtless soon discovered that Oswald 'was a simple-minded, well-meaning man, on whom he could make the impression he chose.' Upon Mr. Oswald's return to London, a meeting of the Cabinet was held, at which the following minute was agreed to:—

'April 23. 1782. Present, Lord Chancellor, Lord President, Duke of Richmond, Marquis of Rockingham, Duke of Grafton, Lord Ashburton, Lord J. Cavendish, Lord Keppel, Gen. Conway, Mr. Fox, Lord Shelburne.

"It is humbly submitted to His Majesty that Mr. Oswald shall return to Paris with authority to name Paris as the place, and to settle with Dr. Franklin the most convenient time for setting on foot a negotiation for a general peace, and to represent to him that the principal points in contemplation are, the allowance of independence to America upon Great Britain's being restored to the situation she was placed in by the treaty of 1763, and that Mr. Fox shall submit to the consideration of the King a proper person to make a similar communication to Mons. de Vergennes." (Vol. i. p. 345.) *

Before Oswald left Paris, Franklin placed in his hands a paper, containing suggestions respecting Canada, for Lord Shelburne's consideration. It threw out the idea that Canada might be voluntarily ceded to the United States, as an indemnity for the losses occasioned by the war; and it concluded with these words:— 'This is mere conversation matter between Mr. Oswald and Mr. Franklin, as the former is not empowered to make propositions, and the latter cannot make any without the concurrence of his colleagues.' Franklin afterwards regretted that he had allowed the paper to go out of his own hands. On his

* We observe that the peculiar mode in which the ministers address the sovereign in private communications, which is now in use, was observed by Mr. Fox at this time. 'Mr. Fox has the honour of transmitting to your Majesty the minute of the Cabinet Council assembled this morning at Lord Rockingham's.' 18 May 1782. (Ib. p. 351.) When this epistolary form was introduced, or by whom, we know not. The letters of Mr. G. Grenville to the King in 1765, printed in the Grenville Papers, vol. iii. p. 4—15., are in the ordinary form. 'I have but just now received the honour of your Majesty's commands on my return home from my Lord Chancellor's, where I have passed the greatest part of the evening.' According to the more recent etiquette, the minister uses the third person, and addresses the Sovereign in the second.

return to Paris, Oswald told Franklin that he had shown the paper to Lord Shelburne, and by his desire left it with him for one night; that he had conversed with Lord Shelburne about it, and it seemed to have made an impression: the paper was then restored to Franklin.*

Oswald returned to Paris early in May, with instructions from Lord Shelburne to arrange with Franklin the preliminaries of time and place for negotiating, and also the announcement that a proper person would be shortly sent by Mr. Fox, 'from whose department that communication is necessarily to proceed,' to treat with M. de Vergennes.† This person was Mr. Grenville, whose speedy arrival, by way of Ostend, was announced by Oswald both to Franklin and the French Minister. Mr. Grenville shortly afterwards arrived at Paris, and was introduced by Franklin to M. de Vergennes, with whom he had a long conference on the subject of his mission.‡ Oswald now returned to

* It is remarkable that Mr. Forth, who had been sent secretly by Lord North to Paris before the change of Government, appears to have offered the cession of Canada as the price of a peace with France. (Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 210.) An account of Forth's mission is given in a despatch of M. de Vergennes, in Flissan, 'Histoire de la Diplomatie Française,' vol. vii. p. 322., ed. 1811, but nothing is there said about an offer to restore Canada to France.

† Lord Shelburne to Franklin, 20th April, 1782. Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 265.

‡ 'The Count de Vergennes (says Franklin) received Mr. Grenville in the most cordial manner, on account of the acquaintance and friendship that had formerly subsisted between *his uncle* and the Count de Vergennes, when they were ambassadors together at Constantinople.' (Ib. p. 273.) The person referred to is Mr. Henry Grenville, brother of Lord Temple, who was ambassador at Constantinople from 1761 to 1765. M. de Vergennes was minister plenipotentiary at the same capital from 1755 to 1768. M. de Vergennes, in a despatch written at the time to the French ambassador in Spain, thus describes Mr. Grenville:—'M. Grenville est très propre à recommander la mission dont il est chargé; c'est un jeune homme de trente ans au plus, qui annonce beaucoup d'esprit et de sagesse, d'honnêteté et de modestie. Il appartient à une famille considérable, qui est liée d'intérêt avec le ministère actuel, et il n'est guère vraisemblable que celui-ci lui eût destiné un rôle aussi plat et aussi peu analogue à sa naissance et à son état, que celui de venir nous ennuyer et nous tromper.' (Flissan, ib. p. 339.) Franklin, on making Mr. Grenville's acquaintance, says, 'he appeared to me a sensible, judicious, intelligent, good-natured, and well-instructed young man, answering well the character Mr. Fox had given me of him.' (Works, ib. p. 272.) These early notices of Mr. Grenville will be read with interest by those who enjoyed the pleasure of his

London, and soon after his arrival, the Cabinet advised the King to direct full powers to be given to Mr. Grenville to make propositions of peace to the belligerent Powers upon the basis of American independence, and his formal commission was accordingly despatched without delay.

Mr. Oswald returned to Paris early in June, bringing with him a paper of memoranda by Lord Shelburne, which he communicated to Franklin. This paper announced that ‘on our (*i. e.* the English) part, commissioners will be named, or any character given to Mr. Oswald, which Dr. Franklin and he may judge conducive to a final settlement of things between Great Britain and America; which Dr. Franklin very properly says, requires to be treated in a very different manner from the peace between Great Britain and France, who have always been at enmity with each other.’* As soon as Franklin received this communication, and foresaw the prospect of negotiating with Oswald, whom he describes as having ‘an air of great simplicity and honesty,’† he became reserved with Mr. Grenville, and showed a reluctance to speak openly to him. Mr. Grenville, combining this circumstance with the incident of the Canada

society in the later years of his long life, as well as by all who appreciate the value of the rare and well-selected library which he bequeathed to the public. Mr. Grenville was born in 1755, and therefore was, at this time, twenty-seven years old.

As the epistolary form in which sovereigns address one another, has lately been made a question of international importance, we subjoin a copy from the State Paper Office of the credential letter sent by George III. to Louis XVI., on the occasion of Mr. Grenville’s mission:—

‘Monsieur mon frère,

‘Ayant fait choix du Sieur Grenville pour se rendre à votre cour en qualité de mon ministre, je vous prie de donner une entière créance à tout ce qu’il vous dira de ma part, et surtout aux assurances qu’il vous donnera de mon estime singulier pour vous, et de mon desir sincère de voir heureusement rétablie entre nous une amitié ferme et durable.

Je suis,

à St. James,
ce 21 Mai, 1782.

Monsieur mon frère,
Votre bon frère,
GEORGE R.

* Franklin’s Works, vol. ix. p. 314.

† We regret to find that our countrymen, seventy years ago, did not find favour in Mr. Grenville’s eyes: ‘He spoke of Mr. Oswald (says Franklin) as an odd kind of man, *but that indeed his nation were generally odd people.*’ (Ib. p. 334.) We may hope that Mr. Grenville lived to change his opinion.

paper, of which he had been informed by Oswald, came to the conclusion that he was crossed by a concurrent negotiator, and that the treaty could never be satisfactorily arranged with such a division of powers. He likewise appears to have thought that there was a deliberate intention of encroaching upon Mr. Fox's province, which he, as Mr. Fox's envoy, resented. Under the influence of these feelings, he wrote to Mr. Fox the important confidential letter of the 4th of June, of which the public were first made aware by the two publications prefixed to our Article. In this letter Mr. Grenville points to the promise of Lord Shelburne to appoint Oswald a commissioner, and to the Canada paper, as evidence that a separate and independent negotiation was proceeding which destroyed his utility. He therefore requests that he may be recalled, and that Lord Fitzwilliam, or some peer of sufficient importance to render it impossible to associate Oswald with him, should be appointed in his place. This letter led to an answer from Fox, asking for 'further proof' of 'this duplicity of conduct,' and speaking of 'the clandestine manner of carrying on a separate negotiation which we complain of;' but particularly inquiring how far Fox and his friends are at liberty to make use of the contents of Mr. Grenville's letter in order to call Lord Shelburne to account. Mr. Grenville replied to Mr. Fox in a letter which seems to have left Paris on the 21st; but before any steps could be taken upon it, Lord Rockingham's fatal illness and death brought the Government to an end. As soon as the news of this event reached Paris, Mr. Grenville resigned his mission, and returned to England.*

The editor of the Buckingham Papers (who seems to have been wholly ignorant of Franklin's detailed account) thus characterises this transaction: —

'It is clear, from the singular facts revealed in this correspondence, that while an *ostensible* minister was despatched to Paris by the general action of the Government, with the sanction of the King, to negotiate terms with the *American* minister, Lord Shelburne had

* The entire private correspondence between Mr. Grenville and Mr. Fox, during this mission, has now been published in the two works named at the head of our Article. The official correspondence is preserved in the State Paper Office, but has never been printed; a brief outline of it is given by Mr. Adolphus in his 'History of England during the Reign of George III.,' vol. iii. c. 44. This correspondence (which we have perused) is conducted with great ability on both sides, and we regret that it still remains in manuscript. We may also remark that the discussion of the questions examined in the text would be more satisfactory if the entire documentary history of the Treaty of 1783 were before the public.

taken upon himself to appoint another negotiator, who was not only not to act in concert with Mr. Grenville, but *whose clandestine mission seems to have been expressly intended to thwart and embarrass him, and whose appointment was without the approval, or even the knowledge, of the Cabinet.*' (Vol. i. p. 26.)

Horace Walpole's account is not very different: —

'While Fox thus unfolded his character so advantageously, Shelburne was busied in devoting himself to the King, and in traversing Lord Rockingham and Fox in every point. If they opened a negotiation, he commenced another underhand at the same court. Mr. Fox despatched Thomas Grenville to Paris. Lord Shelburne sent *one, two, or three* privately to the same place, and addressed them to different ministers or persons of supposed credit.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 321.)

Now, it is quite clear from our narrative of the facts, and from the testimonies which we have cited, that Oswald's first visit to Paris arose out of a letter accidentally addressed by Franklin to Lord Shelburne, before the change of Ministry was known to him; that Oswald returned to Paris with the full knowledge and approbation of the Cabinet, and as bearer of a message that he would be speedily followed by Mr. Grenville, as minister plenipotentiary to treat with the French Court; that he communicated with Mr. Fox when he was in London, and that Mr. Grenville knew he was at Paris, and communicated with him almost daily when he was there.* Mr. Oswald's mission had nothing *clandestine*, in the ordinary sense of the term. It was open and avowed on both sides of the water. It was known to Fox and the Cabinet; and it was recognised in the communications of Mr. Grenville with Franklin and M. de Vergennes. Neither can it be said, with Horace Walpole, that Oswald was sent to thwart Mr. Grenville; for Oswald's mission preceded Mr. Grenville's. Mr. Fox gives this account of the origin of Mr. Grenville's mission, in a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick of the 28th of April: —

'Shelburne has had an answer from Dr. Franklin, who seems much disposed to peace, if general. M. de Vergennes has, it seems, expressed the same sentiments, and wishes to have some opening from hence; in consequence of this, Shelburne's man is to go back this day

* Mr. Fox's letter of instructions to Mr. Grenville (April 30. 1782) begins thus: 'When you arrive at Paris, you will endeavour to see Mr. Oswald as soon as possible, who will probably have announced your arrival.' In a subsequent letter to Mr. Grenville of May 21. Fox speaks of having received his letter by Mr. Oswald, and of having heard from Mr. Oswald an account of the state of affairs at Paris. (*State Paper Office*.)

to Paris, and upon the pretence of the business having begun with the American ministers, he had a great mind, if I would have consented, to have kept even this negotiation in his own hands; but this I would not submit to, and so Grenville is to set out for Paris to-morrow or next day, in order to state our ideas of peace to M. de Vergennes.' (Vol. i. p. 346.)*

These remarks imply that Fox was fully aware of the negotiation with Franklin having been begun by Oswald. Mr. Grenville was then sent by him to treat with the French Government, and he had a regular commission and credentials from the Crown for this purpose; but Oswald had no legal authority to treat, and had merely directions from the Secretary of State.

Let us now consider how far the two points raised by Mr. Grenville deserved to be considered in the serious light in which he and Mr. Fox regarded them. The most important of the two was the announcement, brought back by Oswald on his second visit to Paris, that Lord Shelburne was prepared to appoint him commissioner to treat with the American agents, his intention to make this appointment not having been previously communicated to Fox and his other colleagues. It is impossible not to see that if a proper cordiality had subsisted between Lord Shelburne and the rest of the Cabinet, he would have mentioned this intention to Lord Rockingham or Mr. Fox, before he announced it to Oswald. Nevertheless, his omission to take this step does not seem to us to have rendered it necessary to disturb the course of the negotiation by the strong measure to which Mr. Grenville resorted. If Mr. Grenville found by experience that a separate negotiator for America was likely to interfere with the rest of the negotiation, he could have represented this conclusion to his own Government, and the Cabinet would have then decided the question with the advantage of his opinion. Oswald had not as yet been appointed; and the appointment might still be arrested, notwithstanding Lord Shelburne's announcement, if the Cabinet thought fit to commit the entire negotiation to one person.† It is, however, to be observed that when the bill then

* See in Flassan, *ib.* pp. 328-59., the despatches of M. de Vergennes describing his interviews with Mr. Oswald and Mr. Grenville. It appears that he understood perfectly the state of the case, for he says of Oswald: 'Envoyé par Lord Shelburne, il n'avait point de commission pour moi, parceque ce secretaire d'état n'ayant dans son département que l'Amérique et l'Irlande, c'est M. Fox qui est chargé uniquement des affaires de l'Europe.' (P. 333.)

† A similar misunderstanding arose between the two Secretaries of State about a negotiation at Paris in 1723. George I. was desirous of obtaining a dukedom for a French gentleman, who was to marry a

pending in Parliament, for enabling the King to conclude a peace with the American colonies, had passed, Oswald eventually received, under Lord Shelburne's Administration, a formal commission to negotiate with the American commissioners. * Mr. Fitzherbert (afterwards Lord St. Helen's) was appointed to succeed Mr. Grenville, with full powers to treat with France, Spain, and Holland. It appears from the correspondence in the State Paper Office that Oswald corresponded with Mr. Townshend, the Home Secretary, and Mr. Fitzherbert with Lord Grantham, the Foreign Secretary: so that the division of the negotiation between the two secretaries and their envoys continued to the signature of the preliminaries, and, so far as we know, did not produce the inconvenient results which Mr. Grenville anticipated, and about which he so much alarmed Mr. Fox. It may be added that M. de Rayneval, a confidential subordinate of M. de Vergennes, and also M. de Heredia, a person connected with the Spanish embassy, came over to London, and negotiated with Lord Shelburne; and that Mr. Strachey, the Under Secretary in the Home Department, was sent to Paris to assist Mr. Oswald; so that even other negotiators were added before the preliminaries of the treaty could be settled. † When the change

daughter of his mistress, Madame de Platen. Lord Carteret accordingly instructed Sir Luke Schaub, the English ambassador at Paris, to make interest for this purpose. 'This affair (says Lord Mahon) belonged to Carteret, as secretary for the Southern department, in which France was comprised, and the other secretary had no claim to interlope in his province. Nevertheless, Lord Townshend, unwilling to see an affair of so much interest in the hand of a rival, determined, if possible, to draw it from his management. With this view, and at the instigation of Walpole, he despatched his brother Horace to Paris, under the pretence of settling the accession of Portugal to the Quadruple Alliance, but in reality to watch the movements and counteract the influence of Schaub.' (Vol. ii. p. 57.) This intrigue led to an open breach between the two secretaries, and to the dismissal of Lord Carteret.

* The intention to appoint Oswald as commissioner to negotiate with the Americans, had, however, been communicated to him by Lord Shelburne, in a letter dated June 30., the very day before Lord Rockingham's death. In this letter he states, that as soon as the Act had passed he lost no time in taking the King's commands for directing a commission to be made out conformable to the powers given to his Majesty. (MS. State Paper Office. A portion of the letter is printed in Franklin's Works, *ib.* p. 345.) He does not, however, say that he took the King's pleasure upon the appointment of Oswald.

† Concerning M. de Rayneval's secret mission, see Flassan, *ib.* p. 344; Franklin, *ib.* p. 420. He is mentioned in the Mem. of Fox, vol. ii. p. 9., under the name of 'M. de Reanervalle.' A correspond-

of Government took place, the Duke of Manchester was sent by Mr. Fox in the place of Mr. Fitzherbert, and Mr. David Hartley in the place of Oswald; and their names appear respectively at the foot of the definitive treaties with France, Spain, and the United States, signed in September 1783. Both, however, as appears from the letters in the State Paper Office, corresponded with Mr. Fox. Lord North seems to have waived his right of instructing Mr. Hartley. No result, however, was obtained by Mr. Hartley's negotiation. The definitive treaty with the United States was identical with the preliminaries: so that Mr. Fox ended by adopting the precise results of Oswald's negotiation.

There was undoubtedly a great want of cordiality between Lord Shelburne and Fox, amounting to distrust and dislike; and a mutual jealousy of power, very undesirable in two Secretaries of State. Lord Shelburne may have acted, in his instructions to Oswald, without sufficient reference to the Foreign Secretary; but there is no evidence of any *intrigue* on Lord Shelburne's part, or of any attempt to negotiate through Oswald upon terms more acceptable to the King, or less favourable to America, than those prescribed by Fox to Mr. Grenville.* * The King, as we have seen, only a month or two before, had been meditating a retirement to Hanover rather than consent to the independence of America. Yet this prin-

ence between M. de Rayneval and Lord Shelburne is preserved among Lord Shelburne's papers. M. de Rayneval first came to England in September 1782, under the assumed name of Castel; he returned shortly afterwards, and made a second visit in December. A short notice of him will be found in the 'Biogr. Universelle,' Art. *Gérard de Rayneval*. Mr. Strachey was sent over by Mr. Townshend to assist Oswald, on Oct. 23. 1782. (*Letter in State Paper Office; Franklin*, ib. p. 422.)

* 'There was (says Lord Holland) great mistrust and jealousy on both sides, much mystery and concealment on that of Lord Shelburne, which Mr. Fox and Mr. Grenville attributed, *perhaps too hastily*, to a secret understanding with the King. It is possible, and not improbable, that Grenville suspected more concealment, intrigue, and counteraction than really subsisted.' (*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 475. 477.) Franklin makes the following remarks in his journal: 'Lord Shelburne seems to wish to have the management of the treaty; Mr. Fox seems to think it in his department. I hear that the understanding between these Ministers is not quite perfect. . . . I imagine we might go on very well with either of them, though I should rather prefer Oswald; but I apprehend difficulties if they are both employed, especially if there is any misunderstanding between their principals.' (*Works*, ib. p. 336.)

ciple was conceded from the moment of Mr. Grenville's mission ; and Franklin was so well-pleased with Oswald, and so satisfied of his desire to settle the peace on terms favourable to America, that he expressed a strong wish that Oswald should be appointed to negotiate with him. Franklin's anxiety to secure Oswald's appointment is a decisive proof that 'Shelburne's man' was not desirous of promoting the views which the King had so fondly cherished ; but, on the contrary, that he was desirous of promoting the views which the King had quite recently held in the utmost abhorrence.* So far was Lord Shelburne from yielding, like Lord North, to the King's prejudices on this subject, that his friends took credit to him for having persuaded the King to acquiesce in American independence.†

That Lord Shelburne did not use Oswald as the instrument of any royal intrigue, or for the purpose of inculcating any peculiar views of his own, is evident from Franklin's complaints of the scantiness of Oswald's communications. In writing to Mr. Laurens, on the 20th of April 1782, he says that Oswald had brought him a letter from Lord Shelburne assuring him that Oswald 'was fully apprised of his (Lord Shelburne's) mind.' 'Mr. Oswald, however (adds Franklin), could give me no other particulars of his Lordship's mind, but that he was sincerely disposed to peace.‡' On his second visit to Paris Franklin says: 'On the whole, I was able to draw so little from Mr. Oswald of the sentiments of Lord Shelburne, who had mentioned him as entrusted with the communication of them, that I could not but wonder at his being sent again to me, especially as Mr. Grenville was so soon to follow.'§ In writing to Mr. Adams, on the 8th of May, Franklin says that Lord Shelburne informs him that Mr. Oswald is instructed to communicate to him his Lordship's thoughts. 'He is, however (Franklin adds), very sparing of such communication.'|| On the tenth of May, Franklin 'found him in the same friendly dispositions, and very desirous of good, and seeing an end put to this ruinous

* A portrait of himself, which Franklin presented to Oswald, when the treaty was concluded, was given by his nephew, the late member for Glasgow, to Mr. Joseph Parkes, in whose possession it now remains in London.

† Gen. Conway made this statement in the House of Commons, in the ministerial explanations after Lord Rockingham's death, July 9. 1782. See also the expressions in Vaughan's letter, above.

‡ Works, *ib.* p. 254.

§ *Ib.* p. 269.

|| *Ib.* p. 270.

'war. But (he says) I got no further sight as to the sentiments of Lord Shelburne respecting the terms.'*

Mr. Grenville is reported by Franklin to have expressed at Paris the opinion that 'Mr. Fox's resignation would be fatal to the negotiation.' Lord Shelburne, however, instructed him 'to repeat every assurance of the King's desire of peace, and not to leave any impression on the minds of those with whom he is in treaty of the least relaxation from the intention and spirit of the negotiation as hitherto carried on.'† Mr. Oswald seems to have lost no time in treating with Franklin; on the 10th of July he reports the first distinct proposal of terms made on the part of America; and the negotiation proceeded in an uninterrupted manner. It may be added, that the negotiation with America, and that with France and Spain, seem to have proceeded independently of each other, and the preliminaries were signed with America without the knowledge of the French Government.

With regard to the Canadian paper, the other point brought forward by Mr. Grenville, we confess that we cannot regard it otherwise than as a very trifling affair; and we are unable to understand how Lord Holland and Mr. Allen could have viewed it in so serious a light. When Oswald received the paper from Franklin, he was not invested with the formal character of a negotiator. He had no commission from the King; and Franklin gave it to him, not as a proposition during a negotiation, but as a suggestion, or matter for consideration. The paper was treated as confidential; and Franklin evidently did not intend that it should go further than Lord Shelburne himself. It required no answer, nor was any answer sent to it by Lord Shelburne; but the original paper was returned. There was, in our judgment, nothing, either in the contents of the paper or in the manner in which it came into his hands, which rendered it incumbent on Lord Shelburne to communicate it to his colleagues. It may be observed, too, that Oswald did communicate its purport to Mr. Grenville, with whom the conduct of the main negotiation rested; so that no possible inconvenience could have arisen from Lord Shelburne's silence on the subject.

Lord Holland speaks of Franklin having been 'encouraged by the prospect of some new concessions, and especially of Canada, to hold aloof from the overtures made to him through Mr. Grenville;‡ and Mr. Allen says that 'it is impossible

* Works, p. 276. Oswald disclaimed to Franklin all personal views, and all wish to remain at Paris. Ib. p. 316.

† Franklin, ib. pp. 366, 367.

‡ Mem. of Fox, vol. i. p. 469.

‘to justify Lord Shelburne for his *favourable* reception of so important a paper as the one he had received from Franklin about Canada.’* There is nothing in Franklin’s account to justify the inference that Lord Shelburne had expressed any opinion upon the paper brought by Oswald; he certainly sent no message to Franklin respecting it. We are, however, able, by the favour of the Marquis of Lansdowne, to lay before the reader a documentary proof that the ‘favourable reception’ of the paper in question must have proceeded from Oswald’s imagination. In a volume of miscellaneous papers relating to the peace of 1783, collected by Lord Shelburne—now in Lord Lansdowne’s possession—is a set of notes by Lord Shelburne for a conversation with Oswald, dated the 28th of April, 1782, and therefore written shortly before Oswald’s second visit to Paris. Among these notes are some remarks on the Canada paper with reference to the passage in which Franklin says, ‘I do not know that the Americans will insist on reparation; perhaps they may.’† We annex a copy of the notes in question, premising only that the Cabinet minute, mentioned at the beginning, appears from Franklin’s Journal to have been communicated to him by Oswald, but without any copy being given. ‘He showed me (says Franklin) the Minutes of Council, but did not leave the paper with me.’‡ As to the remark on the West Indies, it should be observed that Rodney’s action took place on the 12th of April; so that it had already occurred when this memorandum was written, though the news had not reached England.

MEMORANDUMS TO MR. OSWALD IN CONVERSATION, 28TH APRIL 1782.

Memorandums of General Instruction.

‘A copy of the Cabinet Minutes to be shewn to Doctor Franklin, but he must have no copy of it.

‘A fleet of upwards of forty ships in the West Indies—highly probable we shall intercept the reinforcement of the three ships for De Grasse.

‘The French islands in great distress.

‘A blow or two at sea may decide a great deal.

‘Insist, in the strongest manner, that if America is independent she must be so of the whole world. No secret, tacit, or ostensible connection with France.

‘If the negotiation breaks off, all our rights in America to stand as before.

* Mem. of Fox, vol. i. p. 384.

† Franklin’s Works, vol. ix. p. 251.

‡ Ib. p. 266.

Remarks on the Private Paper.

'1st. Why does he say that he does not know of the Americans having any intention of making claims of indemnification, he and others having full powers.— That is not open. — No reparation to be thought of.—The money spent in America is more than sufficient indemnification for all particular losses. Lord Shelburne has a manuscript of Sir William Petty to send in return for this paper. The title of it is to show that Ireland would have been in a state of poverty and uncivilised savageness if it had not been for the money expended by the English in their wars in that country.

'All ideas of a supposed justice in claims of indemnification to be disowned ; and if started, to be waived as much as possible.

'It is reasonable to expect a free trade, unencumbered with duties, to every part of America.

'Make early and strict conditions, not only to secure all debts whatever due to British subjects, but likewise to restore the loyalists to a full enjoyment of their rights and privileges. And their indemnification to be considered. Lord Shelburne will never give up the Loyalists. The Penn family have been sadly used, and Lord Shelburne is personally interested for them, and thinks it his duty to be so for all.

'The private paper desires Canada for three reasons :—

'1st. By way of reparation. — Answer. No reparation can be heard of.

'2nd. To prevent future wars. — Answer. It is to be hoped that some more friendly method will be found.

'3rd. Loyalists as a fund of indemnification to them.— Answer. No independence to be acknowledged without their being taken care of.

'A compensation expected for New York, Charlestown, and Savannah. Penobscott to be always kept.'

These observations on the Canada paper show that, if Lord Shelburne had sent any answer to it by Oswald, it would not have been a favourable one. The probability is, that he made no remark upon it to Oswald, fearing that he might offend Franklin ; and that Oswald construed his silence into approbation. There is likewise another paper of similar notes, which ends with the following passage :— ' Tell him (Franklin) candidly and confidentially, Lord Shelburne's situation with the King : that he was sent for to form the Ministry.

' That his lordship will make no use of it but to keep his word with mankind, and is under as little apprehension of being deceived himself, as unwilling to deceive others. In short, that he knows the bottom to be sound.'

The purpose of this projected communication was to satisfy Franklin that the King was not secretly hostile to the negotiation, and that the American negotiators need not fear that the treaty would be ultimately defeated by the King's interference.

It should be added that the cession of Canada was afterwards formally proposed by Franklin to Oswald, when the latter had been appointed Commissioner, and was reported to his own government, in a letter of July 12.; but that the proposition was not assented to.*

Lord Holland remarks that, 'this resignation of Mr. Fox is unquestionably one of the *two* passages of his public life most open to animadversion, and most requiring explanation.'† The wisdom of this decision resolves itself into a question of general mistrust of Lord Shelburne; for Lord Shelburne's accession to the Treasury would have placed another person at the Home Office, who would have had the control of the American negotiator. Mr. Fox thus describes his motives for resignation, in a

* The story of Franklin's coat (the truth of which has been denied by Sparks) is traced by Lord Mahon to the signing of the Treaty with France in 1778. (See his note, vol. v. p. 329.) Mr. Allen remarks that 'the anecdote rests on authority not slightly to be rejected. It was related to Lord Holland by Lord St. Helen's, one of the plenipotentiaries employed in negotiating the treaty, and the lasting impression it made on Lord St. Helen's leaves little doubt of the accuracy of his recollection. He could not speak without indignation of the triumphant air with which Franklin told them he had laid by and preserved his coat for such an occasion.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 385.) Lord St. Helen's, then Mr. Fitzherbert, was sent to Paris to negotiate with France, when Mr. Grenville resigned. He had no personal concern with the treaty between France and America in 1778; and therefore, if his testimony is not rejected, we must suppose that Franklin wore the coat *twice*. Mr. Fitzherbert signed the preliminaries with France and Spain, but Oswald signed those with America; the definitive treaty with America was signed by Mr. Hartley for England. Mr. Fitzherbert could not have been present, *officially*, when any signature with Franklin took place.

Mr. Fitzherbert, in a letter to Lord Grantham, of February 9. 1783 (preserved among the Shelburne papers), has the following passage:—'Dr. Franklin seems anxious to return to America, which I am sorry for, being persuaded that he will do his utmost, when there, to prevent all revival of goodwill and cordiality with the mother country; his rancour and inveteracy against which are as violent as ever. I could mention to your Lordship instances of this which would be almost ludicrous, if anything can deserve that name which is likely to produce such serious consequences.' The letter from Mr. Hartley to Mr. Fox, of 3rd September, 1783, S.P.O., reporting the signature of the Definitive Treaty with America, describes the existence of a very friendly feeling with the American Commissioners on that occasion.

† Vol. i. p. 472. The *other* passage alluded to by Lord Holland is the coalition with Lord North. (See vol. ii. p. 62.)

letter to Mr. Grenville of the 5th of July:—‘I am sure my staying would have been a means of deceiving the public and betraying my party; and these are things not to be done for the sake of any supposed temporary good. I feel that my situation in the country, my power, my popularity, my consequence,—nay, my character, are all risked: but I have done right, and therefore in the end it must turn out to have been wise.’*

Lord Shelburne had held office in the Duke of Grafton's Administration, and had been a Secretary of State at the age of twenty-nine. He was a man of ability, and was eminent as a speaker; he belonged to the Whig party, but his more immediate political connexion was with Lord Chatham. During the American War, he continued in active opposition to the Government, and he had never been a favourite of the King. Before he left the Duke of Grafton's Cabinet in 1768, ‘instigations to remove him (as we learn from the Duke's Memoirs) fell daily from the King.’† Ten years later, in March 1778, the King, writing to Lord North, thus expresses himself:—‘I am willing, through your channel, to accept any description of persons that will come avowedly to the support of your Administration; and, as such, do not object to Lord Shelburne and Mr. Barré, whom personally, perhaps, I dislike as much as Alderman Wilkes.’‡ In December 1779, Lord Shelburne made a speech

* Buckingham Papers, vol. i. p. 55.

† Cited by Lord Mahon, vol. v. p. 202., 3d ed. See his character of Lord Shelburne, *Ib.*, p. 209.

Lord Shelburne seems to have been a strong free-trader, at a time when such opinions among statesmen were almost unknown. The following passage occurs in a letter from Benjamin Vaughan to Franklin, of February, 1783:—‘The boldness of my friend's (Lord Shelburne's) conduct, has done infinite service to men's minds, as his conversation has done to the royal mind. You will take pleasure in hearing that he talked of making England a free port; for which, he said, we were fitted by nature, capital, love of enterprise, maritime connexions, and position between the Old and New World, and the North and South of Europe; and that those who were best circumstanced for trade, could not but be gainers by having trade open.’ (*Works*, *ib.* p. 489.) According to Lord Holland, Bentham always said, that ‘Lord Shelburne was the only Minister he ever heard of who did not fear the people.’ (*Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. i., p. 41.) M. Dumont, on coming to England in 1785, acquired the friendship of Lord Shelburne, and was entrusted with the education of his sons. (*Dumont, Souvenirs sur Mirabeau*, p. ii.)

‡ Lord Mahon, vol. vi., App. p. lvi. A story is told of Wilkes, after he had given up the trade of a patriot, having been present at a

in the House of Lords, in an American debate, which Mr. Fitzpatrick describes as ‘excellent, very violent, and *very personal to the King.*’* It may be added that the King’s aversion for Lord Chatham, with whom Lord Shelburne had acted, was latterly not less than his aversion for Fox. If, therefore, the King showed any preference for Lord Shelburne in 1782, it must have been, not because he liked him much, but because he disliked Fox more. Lord Shelburne, indeed, according to Lord Holland’s testimony, ‘always complained that the King had ‘tricked and deserted him in 1782 and 1783;’ and ‘he always ‘suspected the Court of secretly conniving at his downfall.’† On the other hand, the King complained of Lord Shelburne for resigning the Government too easily, and for not prolonging the fight against the Coalition. In an audience granted to Lord Temple, upon his return from Ireland, His Majesty ‘recapitulated all the transactions of that period, with the strongest ‘encomium upon Mr. Pitt, and *with much apparent acrimony ‘hinted at Lord Shelburne*, whom he stated to have abandoned a ‘position which was tenable, and particularly so after the popular ‘resentment had been roused.’‡

Lord Holland, in his ‘Memoirs of the Whig Party,’ has given a full-length portrait of Lord Shelburne, founded on personal knowledge. His character is there summed up in the following words:—‘His chief merits were courage, decision of ‘character, and discernment in discovering the talents of inferior. Want of judgment was his great defect. An imperious character, and suspicion, with its consequences, his ‘ruling vices.’§ If habits of suspicion, and a persuasion of the

party with the Prince of Wales, and having joined in singing ‘God ‘save the King.’ The Prince called to him, and asked how long he had sung that song. ‘Ever since I have had the honour of knowing ‘your Royal Highness,’ was the answer.

* Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 239.

† Ibid. vol. i. p. 479.; vol. ii. p. 65.

‘The late Earl of Shelburne told a friend of mine that the King ‘possessed one art beyond any man he had ever known: for that, by ‘the familiarity of his intercourse, he obtained your confidence, procured from you your opinion of different public characters, and then ‘availed himself of this knowledge to sow dissension.’—(*Nicholl’s Recollections and Reflections during the Reign of George III.*, vol. i. p. 389.) The same writer states, Ibid. p. 51., that the King ordered ‘the members of his household to express their disapprobation of the ‘peace, and thus affronted Lord Shelburne.’

‡ Buckingham Papers, vol. i. p. 303. The latter words allude to the incipient unpopularity of the Coalition.

§ Vol. i. p. 42.

general dishonesty of mankind, had prevented Lord Shelburne from being frank and open in his dealings, and had earned him the nickname of Malagrida, this fact was well known to Fox when he accepted office as his colleague. The arguments founded on this general presumption were not, as we have seen, greatly strengthened by the Oswald affair. It cannot be supposed that Fox was influenced by such appeals to his self-love, as that administered by Burke, when he spoke of 'the utter impossibility of his acting for any length of time *as a clerk* in Lord Shelburne's Administration.*' If Fox had put forward his pretensions to the office of Prime Minister, he might consistently have resigned because they were rejected. But he proposed the appointment of the Duke of Portland to that office, and did not object to serve under *him*. The objection therefore, was, not to the subordination, but to the person of the chief.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, in a letter of July 5., thus pointedly describes the opinions of the public upon Fox's resignation: — 'All persons who have any understanding and no office, are of opinion that Charles has done right: all persons who have little understanding are frightened; and all persons who have offices, with some brilliant exceptions, think he has been hasty.' (Vol. i. p. 461.) Lord Temple, in a letter to Mr. Grenville, written on the previous day, gives the following account of a conversation which he had had with Fox at the House of Lords: —

'He stated his knowledge that Lord Shelburne would succeed to Lord Rockingham, and his idea of throwing up. I stated Lord Shelburne's promises to measures, which I found Lord Shelburne had made to him; but *the loss of the object*, which was evidently a favourite point with him, seemed to affect him much. I repeated my apprehensions that the people would not stand by him in his attempt to quit upon private grounds, which, from their nature would appear to be a quarrel for offices, and not a public measure. He saw all this, and said that it had been urged to him by several, but that he was not determined My opinion, from all whom I have seen, is, that Fox has undone himself with the public; and his most intimate friends seem of the same opinion.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 51.)

'The step (says Lord Holland) was universally lamented, and very naturally censured, by many friends of freedom and peace, who were unacquainted with the personal character of Mr. Fox and his colleagues, and who saw in it nothing but a fatal division in a body of men, to whom they were looking for a restoration of the blessings of peace, and the re-establishment of a virtuous system of government at home. To them it seemed the result of mere personal jealousy and

* *Memorials of Fox*, vol. i. p. 457.

squabbles for superiority, in which the interests of the public were overlooked.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 472.)*

It appears that Mr. Fox had announced his intention of resigning, a few days before Lord Rockingham's death, in consequence of a decision of the Cabinet with respect to the recognition of American independence.† This fact was indeed publicly stated by him in the House of Commons, in answer to General Conway, who had intimated that his resignation had been determined by merely personal considerations.‡ It is indeed highly probable that, even if Lord Rockingham had lived, Fox would before long have seceded from the Cabinet. Mr. Fox, however, declared in the same debate that the appointment of Lord Shelburne to the office of First Lord of the Treasury, instead of the Duke of Portland, was one of the reasons of his resignation. Mr. Pitt, like General Conway, attributed Mr. Fox's conduct to private pique, not to public grounds, and contended that he ought to have remained in office, until he had seen Lord Shelburne abandon the principles upon which Lord Rockingham and his friends had acted.

In order to form a proper estimate of Mr. Fox's decision to refuse office with Lord Shelburne, it is necessary to consider his subsequent course, and to compare the political connexion which he abandoned with that which he proceeded to form. Before doing so, however, it is right to advert to the fact, that, when Mr. Pitt formed his administration in 1783, after the dismissal of the Coalition Ministry, he made no offer to Lord Shelburne, although he had, in the previous year, been Chancellor of the Exchequer, and leader of the House of Commons in his administration. This circumstance seems to indicate that he, like Mr. Fox, did not wish for Lord Shelburne as a colleague.§ Lord Shelburne resented this exclusion, and Lord

* Nicholls, *ib.* vol. ii. p. 140., gives it as his opinion that Mr. Fox's separation from Lord Shelburne took place on *private* grounds.

† Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 386. 435. 438-9. 453.

‡ July 9. 1782.

§ Lord Grenville, writing to Lord Temple, on December 7. 1782, says:—'I have said that the complexion of affairs here makes it more unpleasant. Lord Shelburne's evident intention is to make cyphers of his colleagues. Rayneval's arrival at his house at eight in the morning, was not known to Townshend till twelve, nor to any of the others till after four. They cannot be much pleased, but still it is imagined they mean to remain.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 84.) This alludes to the arrival of M. de Rayneval, who was sent by the French Government to London, under a fictitious name, on the business of the peace. The length of time mentioned by Lord Gren-

Holland says that he even hesitated about accepting the marquissate, which was offered him by Mr. Pitt and the Court, as a mark of approbation of the peace.* Although Lord Shelburne accepted this mark of honour from Mr. Pitt's Government, he continued in opposition; taking, however, little part in politics, after his retirement from office.

We are now in full possession of the grounds upon which Mr. Fox acted on this occasion, derived from the most authentic sources, and we can pass judgment upon them without any of those personal feelings by which the minds of contemporaries are inflamed. If Mr. Fox, after a trial of three months, found that he could not act satisfactorily with Lord Shelburne, it must be admitted that he was justified in refusing to hold office in his Administration. But Lord Shelburne's Ministry was a Whig Ministry: it included even a portion of the Rockingham party; none of Lord North's party belonged to it; Mr. Pitt, the leader of the House of Commons, was a decided Whig, and had taken a strong part in overthrowing Lord North's Government. The leading principles of Lord Rockingham's Government, and particularly the recognition of American independence, were avowed by Lord Shelburne. If, therefore, Fox could not make up his mind to serve with Lord Shelburne, we think that, looking both to his duty as a public man, and to his policy as a leader of the larger section of the Whig party, his proper course was to stand aloof, to watch the conduct of the Government, to support it when right, to oppose it when wrong, to observe an armed neutrality, but not, as he actually did, to form a league, offensive and defensive, with the enemy.* When Lord Rockingham died, and the King made Lord Shelburne, and not the Duke of Portland, Prime Minister, there were three courses open to Fox. 1. To remain in Lord Shelburne's Government. 2. To resign with his friends, and to form a separate independent party. 3. To coalesce with Lord North and the Tories. Of these three courses the last was, in our judgment, incomparably the worst; and this was the one which Fox selected.

ville does not seem very great. After Lord Shelburne's resignation, Lord Grenville, also writing to Lord Temple, says, speaking of the Coalition:—'Yet these are the men who accuse Lord Shelburne of *'duplicity, without having produced one instance during a six months' ministry.'* (*Ibid.* p. 205.) Lord Grenville was probably by this time made aware of what had passed with his brother at Paris nearly twelve months before.

* *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. i. p. 43. Some remarks upon this peerage will be found in this Journal, vol. xxv. p. 212, in a review of Wraxall's Historical Memoirs.

As soon as Lord Shelburne's Ministry was formed, a practical solution of the problem of the three bodies had to be found. Gibbon, writing near the commencement of the ensuing Session, mentions a calculation of the comparative strength of the three parties in the House of Commons, which gave 140 votes to the Government, 120 to Lord North, 90 to Fox, the rest unknown or uncertain.* In this state of things a combination of any two would defeat the third. The views of the Government were therefore naturally turned towards a junction with some portion of the Opposition. It was, however, laid down as a principle by Lord Shelburne and Mr. Pitt that they would not admit Lord North into the Cabinet: though they were willing to negotiate with some of his followers.† Hence they looked in the other direction, and on the 11th of February, 1783, Mr. Pitt sought an interview with Mr. Fox, in order to invite him to join Lord Shelburne's Government. The following is Bishop Tomline's account of what passed on this occasion:—

‘Neither Mr. Pitt nor Lord Shelburne saw any reason why they should not act with Mr. Fox. It was therefore agreed that an offer should be made to him to return to office; for which purpose Mr. Pitt waited upon him by appointment. As soon as Mr. Fox heard the object of Mr. Pitt's visit, he asked, whether it was intended that Lord Shelburne should remain First Lord of the Treasury; to which Mr. Pitt answered in the affirmative. Mr. Fox immediately replied, that it was impossible for him to belong to any Administration of which Lord Shelburne was the head.‡ Mr. Pitt observed, that, if that

* Gibbon to Lord Sheffield, Oct. 14. 1782. *Miscellaneous Works*, vol. ii. p. 261., 8vo.

† It is stated in the *Memorials of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 30., that the Duke of Richmond, Lord Keppel, and Mr. Pitt were inclined to a coalition with Fox, but that Lord Shelburne leant to Lord North. Horace Walpole speaks of overtures by Lord Shelburne to Lord North. (*Ib.* p. 12.) Lord Grenville, however, writing to Lord Temple, February 19. 1783, mentions, among some facts, the authenticity of which he vouches, that ‘Lord Shelburne never has made any offer whatever ‘to Lord North.’ This fact was probably stated by him on Mr. Pitt's authority. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 158.) Tomline says, that ‘Mr. Pitt positively objected to any application being made ‘to Lord North.’ (Vol. i. p. 88.) Mr. Dundas told Mr. Adam, that ‘Pitt was ready to negotiate with Lord North's party, on the basis ‘of excluding Lord North personally.’ (*Memorials of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 21.) Lord Temple's private notes likewise mention a coalition with some of Lord North's supporters as practicable, but without Lord North himself. (*Buckingham Papers*, ib. p. 301.)

‡ Mr. Fox did not put forward his own claims to that office, but still insisted on the Duke of Portland. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 12.)

In the debates which followed the dismissal of the Coalition

was his determination, it would be useless for him to enter into any farther discussion, "as he did not come to betray Lord Shelburne;" and he took his leave. This was, I believe, the last time Mr. Pitt was in a private room with Mr. Fox; and from this period may be dated that political hostility, which continued through the remainder of their lives.*

There was nothing at this time, either in the public or personal relations of Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt, which would have prevented them from acting together, and serving in the same Cabinet. Their political principles were similar; and Mr. Fox had spoken with high praise and admiration of Mr. Pitt's abilities and character upon his first appearance in public life. 'Fox,' says Walpole, 'had fondly espoused him, and kindly, not jealously nor fearfully, wished to have him his friend.'† It is probable that Fox would have now consented to this union, if his dislike of Lord Shelburne had not formed an obstacle.

The resolution of Lord Shelburne and Pitt not to negotiate

Ministry, Pitt publicly stated that he would not sit in the same Cabinet with Lord North; and after the dissolution (although he had then strong motives for standing well with the King) he spoke of the one virtue of the late Parliament, that 'it had put an end to Lord North's administration, and to the calamitous and ruinous war which he had brought upon the country.' (*Tomline*, vol. i. pp. 359. 478.)

* Life of Pitt, vol. i. p. 89. ed. 3. The date of this offer is fixed by Lord Grenville's letter of Feb. 11. 1783, where he says, 'Pitt told me to-day that it being thought necessary to make some attempt at a junction with Fox, he had seen him *to-day*, when he asked one question, viz., whether there were any terms on which he would come in. The answer was "None, while Lord Shelburne remained;" and so it ended. Upon this (Lord Grenville truly adds) I think one may observe that the one must be very desperate, the other very confident, before such a question could be so put and so answered.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 148.) Tomline appears to refer this interview to 'the end of autumn,' which is clearly a mistake. We suspect, moreover, that the retort ascribed to Pitt, that 'he did not come to betray Lord Shelburne,' was never really uttered; though it doubtless correctly expresses Pitt's feeling at the time. See also Adam's account, 'Mem. of Fox,' vol. ii. p. 33., which agrees with Lord Grenville's, and does not support Tomline's. Walpole, *Ibid.*, p. 12., says that Fox had been sounded by the Duke of Richmond and Lord Keppel *before* Pitt's visit.

† Mem. of Fox, vol. ii. p. 5. See also Lord Holland's account, vol. i. p. 262. 'Till the unfortunate breach between the Whigs and Lord Shelburne, when Mr. Pitt sided with the latter, Mr. Fox never lost an opportunity of extolling the talents and praising the conduct of young Pitt.'

with Lord North, and the refusal of Fox to join Lord Shelburne's Government, produced an attempt of common friends to bring Fox and Lord North together. Fox wished to turn out Lord Shelburne. Lord North was resentful at being proscribed by him and Pitt; and the object was speedily effected. On the 14th of February, three days after the interview with Fox, he and Lord North met for the first time since their estrangement; and their interview is thus described:—

'They agreed to lay aside all former animosity, Mr. Fox declaring that he hoped their Administration would be *founded on mutual good will and confidence*, which was the only thing that could make it permanent and useful. They agreed, also, that nothing more was required to be done in reducing the influence of the Crown by economical reform, and that on parliamentary reform every man should follow his own opinion. Mr. Fox having urged that the King should not be suffered to be his own Minister, Lord North replied: "If you mean there should not be a Government by departments, I agree with you; I think it a very bad system. There should be one man, or a Cabinet, to govern the whole, and direct every measure. Government by departments was not brought in by me. I found it so, and had not vigour and resolution to put an end to it. *The King ought to be treated with all sort of respect and attention, but the appearance of power is all that a king of this country can have.* Though the Government in my time was a Government by departments, the whole was done by the Ministers, except in a few instances." (Vol. ii. p. 37.)

Since the accession of Lord Shelburne's Ministry, the negotiations for a peace, on the basis of American Independence, had been steadily pursued. The preliminaries had first been signed with America, and subsequently with France and Spain. The settlement of this all-important question was announced in the King's Speech, and the Preliminaries were subsequently presented to Parliament. It was agreed that this question was a favourable field for a trial of strength between the coalesced parties of Fox and Lord North, and the Government. A motion of censure upon the Preliminaries of Peace was accordingly made by Lord J. Cavendish, and carried by 207 to 190 votes. Upon this defeat, Lord Shelburne and his Cabinet resigned (Feb. 24. 1783).

After a long *interministerium* (as Walpole calls it), and an attempt on the King's part to induce Mr. Pitt to attempt the formation of a Government—an undertaking which he steadfastly declined—a new Administration was formed, of which the Duke of Portland (as originally proposed by Fox) was the head, and in which Fox himself and Lord North were the

Secretaries of State. The other Cabinet offices were chiefly filled with followers of Fox.

Whatever admiration may be felt for the abilities, the eloquence, the patriotism, the courage, and the public spirit of Mr. Fox, no judicious and impartial biographer will, as it seems to us, seek to justify, or even to palliate, his coalition with Lord North. Lord J. Russell accordingly condemns, and does not defend it. In every point of view, it was an ill-assorted union. The political principles of the two chiefs were diametrically opposed to each other. Lord North had been, as Minister, the passive instrument of the Royal will; Fox had waged a vehement war against the King and his policy, and had, at last, achieved a victory over both. During the Parliamentary conflicts of the American war, there was scarcely a form of blame, or even of vituperation, within the compass of the English language, which Fox had not applied to Lord North: not only his conduct, his policy, and his principles, but his character, his honour, and his honesty, had been unsparingly denounced. Hints of impeachment had even been thrown out. These debates were quite recent in the beginning of 1783: the very words of Fox's terrible philippics against Lord North's profligate and ruinous administration must have been still ringing in the ears of the members who saw them take their seats, side by side, on the Treasury Bench, as the two Secretaries of State. All the disgraceful events of the latter years of the American war, and the censures which they had entailed on the Ministers who then mismanaged public affairs, were fresh in every one's thoughts; it was scarcely necessary to resort to such reminders as the 'Beauties of Fox, Burke, and North,' which were printed and circulated by the enemies of the 'monstrous and unnatural Coalition.' These were matters of universal notoriety, and the nation was shocked by a union of parties, in which they could see so little of public principle; so little to justify that 'mutual goodwill and confidence,' of which Fox spoke in his interview with Lord North. There was, therefore, no disposition to make in favour of the Coalition the allowance suggested by Lord Holland; namely, that Lord North had been insincere in his American policy, that he had carried on the war in order to please the King, and that the difference between his *real* opinions and the opinions of Fox was not considerable.*

* See 'Memorials of Fox,' vol. i. pp. 195. 254., vol. ii. p. 63. We think that Lord Holland's meaning is mistaken by Lord John in his note on the former passage. His object, as it seems to us, is to vindicate Mr. Fox, on the ground that Lord North *really* agreed with him in opinion.

For the public knew nothing of his secret opinions; they had not the privilege (which we now enjoy) of reading his private correspondence with the King; they judged him by his acts and his avowed opinions; and they knew that his course and that of Fox had, on all the leading questions of public policy, for the last eight years, but, above all, on the great question of the American war, been diametrically opposed. They thought that if Fox was right in his invectives against Lord North in the years 1774 to 1782, he could not be right in coalescing with Lord North in 1783. Besides, it might be felt that there is a medium between rancorous vindictiveness, and a spiritless oblivion of injuries. Though Lord North's well-tryed good-nature would prevent him from cherishing resentful spite, there was something, in our judgment, inexpressibly mean in the tameness which the King's late favourite, covered with the scars of Fox's mighty sword, hastened to accept office in what was virtually *his* administration. Hence the public were more inclined to blame Lord North for joining Fox, than Fox for joining Lord North. Neither, however, escaped the unpopularity which attended their coalition: the public are, in general, sufficiently ready to believe that Ministers are influenced in their conduct by a mere love of place. On this occasion, it was natural for them to assume that Lord North and Fox were actuated by this motive, when they saw two such determined opponents coalesce in order to obtain office. It may be noted that if Fox's principles, as to the colleagues with whom he acted, were as latitudinarian as his coalition with Lord North evinces, it is difficult to understand why he should have refused to serve with Lord Shelburne, on the ground that he could not place entire confidence in him.*

While the nation disapproved of the Coalition on grounds of public policy, the King resented it still more acutely on grounds of personal feeling. He had for some time entertained the strongest aversion for Fox, his rival, his enemy, and now his conqueror and master; and that aversion had been recently strengthened by the friendship which had grown up between Fox and the Prince of Wales, now in his twenty-first year. The King had never loved his eldest son †; but his hatred for Fox

* Mr. Adolphus, 'History of George III.' vol. iii. p. 463., says of the Coalition, 'In no action of his life had Mr. Fox displayed less discernment.'

† Even so early as Nov. 28. 1781, Walpole has the following entry in his 'Diary':—'The King, as if he had never used the Duke of Gloucester ill, opened his mind to him on his son, the Prince of Wales, and his other brother, the Duke of Cumberland, the latter of

was aggravated by the belief that he had alienated the Prince's affections from him, and corrupted his principles. When the Coalition Ministry was formed, the Prince and Fox were on the most intimate terms. 'A series of notes from the Prince to him, of this date, beginning 'Dear Charles,' and written in a tone of confidential familiarity, are printed in these memoirs.* The King was said to have called the Coalition Ministry, 'his son's 'Ministry,' and his dislike of Fox, combined with his jealousy of the Prince, became, at this time, in Walpole's words, *a rankling ulcer*.† Nor were his feelings towards Lord North much more friendly. There were two Ministers to whom, in the course of his long reign, George III. gave a cordial, sincere, and consistent support. Those two Ministers were Lord Bute and Lord North. Even in the disastrous state of things which the country had reached at the beginning of 1782, the King was ready still to support Lord North, if the Minister could have held up his head against the hurricane of censure which night after night he had to encounter in Parliament. In taking leave

'whom, he said, was governed by Charles Fox and Fitzpatrick, and 'governed the Prince of Wales, whom they wanted to drive into 'Opposition. "When we hunt together," said the King, "neither "my son nor my brother will speak to me; and lately, when the "chase ended at a little village where there was but a single post- "chaise to be hired, my son and brother got into it, drove to "London, and left me to get home in a cart, if I could find one!" He complained, too, that the Prince, when invited to dine with him, 'came an hour too late, and "all the servants saw the father waiting "an hour for the son." (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 269.) When Lord North's Government was falling, the Prince of Wales made interest against him, 'Though,' says Walpole, 'he only influenced one 'vote, that of Lord Melbourne, then recently made an Irish peer.' (*Ibid.* p. 286.) The Prince gave his vote in the House of Lords in favour of Fox's India Bill, at the very moment when the King had been canvassing the Peers against it. (*Tomline's Life of Pitt*, vol. i. pp. 220, 223, 226.) See also the account of Fox's intimate relations with the Prince, in 1785, at the time of the marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 277.)

* Vol. ii. pp. 106—111.

† *Ibid.* pp. 45, 46, 57. Lord Grenville, in describing an interview with the King in March, 1783, says that 'he loaded Fox with every 'expression of abhorrence;' and he added, that much as he disliked both Fox and Lord North, if he was to choose he must certainly prefer the latter to the former. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. pp. 190, 192.) Walpole, indeed, states, that 'when the Coalition Ministry kissed 'hands, the King received Fox graciously, but received Lord North 'with the utmost coldness, and continued to treat him with visible 'aversion.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 56.)

of Lord North on that occasion, the King had said, in the exuberance of his sorrow, that 'he ever had and ever should, look 'on Lord North as a friend, as well as a faithful servant.*' It must, therefore, have been with feelings of poignant disappointment, that he beheld the subject of so much royal favour, and even of royal affection, desert to the enemy, enlist in his service, and by his political influence assist in promoting the defeat and humiliation of his once partial but now deserted master.† If he meditated an escape to Hanover in the preceding year, when Lord North was expelled from office, it was still more natural that he should now again throw out threats of resorting to this extremity; of trying the effects of that royal secession to the Mons Sacer.‡ The iron of the Coalition had indeed entered into his soul, but there was another alternative

* Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 289.

† Lord Grenville, in the letter already quoted, says, that the King spoke of Lord North 'in terms of strong resentment and disgust,' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 191.) Lord Temple mentions the King's language, at a subsequent audience, respecting Pitt and Lord Shelburne, and adds, 'This was naturally attended with strong expressions of resentment and disgust of his Ministers, and of personal abhorrence of Lord North, whom he charged with treachery, and ingratitude of the blackest nature. He repeated, that to such a Ministry he never would give his confidence, and that he would take the first moment for dismissing them.' (*Ibid.* p. 303.) In a letter to Lord Temple of April 1. 1783, the King speaks of 'the uneasiness of his mind at having been thwarted in every attempt to keep the administration of public affairs out of the hands of the most unprincipled Coalition the annals of this or any other nation can equal,' and he afterwards sneers at 'the grateful Lord North.' (*Ibid.* p. 219.) We owe likewise to the kindness of the Marquis of Lansdowne the information that amongst his father's papers there is a report of a conversation between the King and Lord Ashburton (Dunning) about this time, in which the King is described as complaining in strong terms of Lord North's desertion of him. Lord North's *ingratitude* was doubtless what rankled most in the King's mind, and, it must be admitted, not without reason. Lord Mahon ('History of England,' vol. v. p. 253.) remarks, that the King never forgot his obligations to Lord North. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say, that the King never forgot Lord North's obligations to him.

‡ Under March, 1783, Walpole says, 'His counsellors were as inveterate as his Majesty, but had less boldness; finding which, he told the Lord Advocate that sooner than yield he would go to Hanover, and had even prevailed on the Queen to consent.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 44.)

besides Hanover, and he resolved to take the earliest opportunity of shaking off his hated Ministers. We shall see that no long time elapsed before this opportunity presented itself.

The formation of the Coalition Ministry was announced on the 2nd of April, 1783.* Mr. Pitt was pressed by Fox's friends to join it, retaining his office of Chancellor of the Exchequer; but he refused on the ground that he would not serve with Lord North.† Nothing remarkable occurred during the remainder of the Session, and the prorogation took place in July. Parliament met again on the 11th of November, and the King's speech announced with satisfaction the signature of definitive treaties of peace with France, Spain, and the United States of America. Mr. Pitt, now the leader of Opposition, reminded the Ministers that these treaties were substantially identical with the preliminary articles upon which they had turned out the Shelburne Administration. The negotiation of that treaty was chiefly the work of Lord Shelburne himself, and its result was a conclusive proof that he had no wish to

* Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, in the 'Anecdotes of his Life,' vol. i. p. 173., says, that on the day the Coalition Ministry kissed hands, he told Lord J. Cavendish that they had two things against them—the 'closet and the country; that the King hated them, and would take the first opportunity of turning them out, and that the Coalition would make the country hate them.'

† This fact is stated by Tomline, *Ibid.* p. 155. 'Both Adam and Dundas expressed their wish that Pitt could be included in the new arrangement [the Coalition Ministry]. Dundas said he had done all in his power to bring it about, but he found it impossible. . . . He afterwards said, Pitt is impracticable on the subject of union: he proscribes Lord North, and does not even express himself clearly disposed to unite with Fox. He has a high opinion of Fox's abilities, and had always wished to have him in the Government, because he thought it impossible to conduct great and difficult affairs with such abilities to criticise them. But now he seems much estranged from him.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 41.)

Mr. Fox thus expressed himself respecting Pitt, in a letter to Lord Osborn of 9th September, 1783, written under the Coalition Ministry during the recess:—'Next session of Parliament will be a great crisis. *I own I am sanguine about it.* Nothing can go on so well as we do among ourselves, but in my particular situation it is impossible not to feel every day what an amazing advantage it would be to the country if it could ever be in such a state as to promise a permanent administration in the opinion of Europe. If Pitt could be persuaded (but I despair of it), I am convinced if he could, he would do more real service to the country than any man ever did.' (Vol. ii. p. 208.) In speaking of 'my particular situation,' Fox alludes to his office of Foreign Secretary.

make reservations in treating with the United States, and that he was prepared for the fullest recognition of American independence. Some concessions were made to France, and particularly to Spain*; but the really important feature of the treaty was the unqualified recognition of the American colonies as independent States. The preliminaries were unpopular, and Mr. Fox had taken advantage of that unpopularity in order to overthrow a weak Ministry; but the concessions made were necessary, and were wisely adopted by Mr. Fox in the definitive treaties which were signed under his auspices. If any blame was due for the concessions, it should have fallen on those who by their mismanagement of public affairs reduced England to such a state of weakness as compelled her to yield, not on those who extricated her from a hopeless and ruinous war. When the vote of censure was passed, Lord North and the Ministers ought to have changed places.†

* The cession of Gibraltar to Spain was seriously in question at this time. A history of the negotiation respecting it is given in 'Flassan,' ib. pp. 345-353. Lord Grenville, in a letter of Dec., 15. 1782, mentions a rumour that Lord Shelburne was outvoted in the Cabinet upon the question of Gibraltar. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 89.) On two former occasions offers for the cession of Gibraltar had actually been made to Spain by the English Government,—once by General Stanhope in 1718, and again by the Elder Pitt in 1757. (See 'Lord Mahon's History,' vol. ii. p. 127., vol. iv. p. 111.) Speaking of the negotiations for the treaty of 1783, Flassan says, 'Les ministres Anglais du moins, et particulièrement lord Shelburne et lord Grantham, montrèrent de la droiture, et une envie de la paix qui n'était balancée que par la crainte que le parlement ne la trouvât pas assez avantageuse.' (*Ibid.* p. 365.)

† It is curious to observe how general the belief was, both in England and on the Continent, that the power and greatness of this country had been ruined by the loss of the American colonies. 'The era of England's glory,' said Mr. Pitt, in defending the preliminaries of peace, 'is past; she is now under the awful and mortifying necessity of employing a language corresponding with her new condition.' 'The visions of her power and preeminence are passed away.' Coxe, in describing the effects of the Treaty of 1783, says: 'The Bourbon Courts exulted in the success of their machinations, and confidently anticipated the speedy downfall of the British power.' (*Bourbon Kings of Spain*, c. 75.) Again he says: 'France exulted in having wrested the colonies from the mother country, and anticipated the advantages which she expected to derive from the diminution of the British commerce and power. The same opinion prevailed throughout the Continent, and the Court of Vienna in particular prophesied that England would ultimately sink in the unequal contest with the House of Bourbon. Nor were there wanting even in

About a week after the beginning of the Session, Mr. Fox introduced his famous India Bill. Its principal feature was that it vested the government of India, for four years, in a commission of seven persons named in the Bill, and not appointed or removeable by the Crown. As soon as the plan was disclosed, Pitt denounced it as dangerous to the Constitution, and as a violation of the chartered rights of the East India Company; and the most ambitious designs were imputed to its authors. The subject was properly in the department of Lord North, as Home Secretary*, for the same reason that the colonies were in his department; but the measure was introduced and managed by Mr. Fox, who had probably been assisted by Burke's advice in its preparation. The Bill, owing to the numerical strength of the Coalition, soon passed the House of Commons, and it was carried up to the Lords by Mr. Fox at the head of a large body of members on the 9th of December. Here, a different fate awaited it. The King, assisted by the suggestions of artful counsellors, sagaciously perceived that his enemies had given him the opportunity for which he was waiting. The Coalition had rendered Fox unpopular; his India Bill had alarmed the country. A canvass of the Peers against the India Bill was set on foot by the King, partly or chiefly through the medium of Lord Temple. In the House of Lords, the 'King's friends' were numerous; and on the 17th of December the Bill was rejected by 95 to 76 votes. On the following day Fox and Lord North were required to deliver up their seals; and Pitt, seeing the change which had taken place since the spring, now consented to form a Government.

Pitt's Administration, though it lasted sixteen years, did not commence under happy auspices. However great his ability, his age was only twenty-five years; the majority of the House of Commons was against him, and the Coalition had absorbed so many of the leading members, that he had not in that House a single Cabinet minister to assist him. The late Government had been upset by the use of the King's personal influence in soliciting the votes of the Peers against his own Ministers. This royal interference was notorious, and almost avowed; Tomline, in his 'Life of Pitt,' admits and defends it. Pitt doubtless took no part in this intrigue, but he knew of it, and profited by its results to obtain power. Lord Temple, who had accepted the

* England persons of enlightened minds, who regarded this peace as the ruin of their country, and who predicted that "the sun of Great Britain was set for ever." (*House of Austria*, c. 48.)

* Tomline's *Life of Pitt*, vol. i. p. 463.

seals of Secretary of State, and who had been intended for leader of the House of Lords, found the feeling respecting his own conduct so strong, that he resigned his office, in three days, in order that he might meet any charges against himself in a private station. 'This,' says Tomline, 'was the only event of a public nature which I ever knew disturb Mr. Pitt's rest, while he continued in good health.* At that moment Mr. Pitt no doubt felt uncertain whether the waters were not closing around him. So great did the chances appear against his success in his hazardous undertaking, that when his writ was moved, on his acceptance of office, the motion was received with loud and general laughter by the Opposition.† Fox was confident that the attempt would fail.* In a private note written at the time he says, 'We are so strong, that nobody can undertake without madness, and if they do I think we shall destroy them almost as soon as they are formed.† This opinion he openly declared, and it was doubtless shared generally by his party.

The siege was now opened in form; a series of general votes of censure upon Ministers, and addresses to the Crown for the formation of a new Administration, were passed by the House of Commons. The King, however, refused to dismiss his Ministers, and Mr. Pitt refused to resign unless some specific charge was brought against him. The contest was carried on with consummate skill and ability by Fox on the one hand, and sustained with extraordinary coolness, courage, and judgment by Pitt on the other. Fox, however, abstained from going to extremities, being restrained, probably, by the reluctance of some of his friends; and while the struggle was still undecided, an attempt was made by some independent country gentlemen to

* Vol. i. p. 233. Mr. Fox, writing to Lord Northampton, the Irish Chancellor, to inform him of Lord Temple's resignation, says, 'What will follow is not yet known, but I think there can be very little doubt but our Administration will again be established. . . . The confusion of the enemy is beyond all description, and the triumph of our friends proportionable.' Dec. 22. 1783. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 224.)

† Tomline, *Ib.* p. 237.

‡ *Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 221. Compare Tomline, *Ib.* p. 463. At this time it used to be the practice for Cabinet Ministers to appear in the House of Commons in full dress. Hence Lord North is always designated in the debates during the American war as 'the noble Lord in the Blue Ribbon.' We have been informed that, after Mr. Fox had crossed to the Opposition bench, he continued to wear his full dress, in order to mark that, though dismissed by the King, he was still the Minister whom the House kept in power.

bring about a junction between the two combatants.* The King was even prevailed upon to send a written message to the Duke of Portland, to propose a meeting between him and Mr. Pitt.† Mr. Pitt consented to have a conference with the Duke of Portland, 'for the purpose of forming a new Administration on a wide basis, and on fair and equal terms;' but a discussion arose on the meaning of 'equal terms,' and the negotiation was broken off. The Opposition demanded that Pitt should resign before any attempt was made to form a united Government; but Pitt refused this demand, saying, that he could not resign in order to treat for office. The contest had now lasted for two months; the necessary supplies had been granted, and a Mutiny Bill passed; the majorities, which had been forty or fifty at the beginning, had dwindled down to one; and at last, without an Appropriation Act, on the 24th of March the King came down to dissolve the Parliament.‡ Pitt had wisely calculated the effect of time in turning public opinion in his favour. An earlier dissolution might have produced a balanced state of parties. As it was, the influence of general opinion upon the elections, even in the comparatively shackled state of the representation, was decisive. Above 160 members lost their seats, nearly all of whom belonged to the Opposition. The rout of the Coalition was complete, and after the long series of votes of censure carried against Pitt at the end of the preceding Parliament, the first vote in the new House gave him a majority of more than two to one. From that time Mr. Pitt's majority in the House of Commons remained unshaken.

Of this result, the principal cause was Fox's coalition with

* In one of the debates at this time, Mr. Fox said that he respected what he had always understood to be Mr. Pitt's political principles, none of which did any one whom he had consulted wish him to renounce. The union he (Mr. Fox) wished to see take place was a union of principle. (See Tomline, *Ib.* p. 356.)

† Mem. of Fox, vol. ii. p. 234.

‡ The Duke of Richmond, who had separated from Mr. Fox when Lord Shelburne became Prime Minister, was a member of Pitt's Cabinet, and contributed essentially to support him against Fox on this trying occasion. 'His firmness during the memorable contest of 1784 is said to have prevented Mr. Pitt from following the example of his cousin, Lord Temple, by resigning in despair. It was on that occasion George III. was reported to have said there was no man in his dominions by whom he had been so much offended, and no man to whom he was so much indebted, as the Duke of Richmond.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 455) See also Tomline, vol. i. p. 235. His reasons for separating from Fox are stated in Lord Albemarle's *Memoirs of Lord Rockingham* (vol. i. p. 340.).

Lord North. Although it gave him, for the moment, a large parliamentary support, it turned public opinion against him, and rendered his union with Pitt impossible. If his party was not strong enough to stand alone, and some junction was necessary, he clearly made the wrong choice in preferring Lord North to Pitt. His India Bill added to his unpopularity, and had a large share in the consequences of the election of 1784. It is difficult now to understand how the declamatory denunciations of that measure could have produced so great an effect on the country, or how the alarm which was expressed could have been really felt. Pitt may have been under the influence of strong personal prejudice, but his general character forbids the belief that his opposition was insincere. He had doubtless persuaded himself of the reality of the dangers which he described with so much force. The interference with the chartered rights of the Company, so far as they concerned the Government, not the trade, of India, seems to us to require no justification. The Company could have no vested interest in a form of Government which was not conducive to the public welfare. The appointment of an Indian Commission by Parliament, the members of which held their offices on the same tenure as the Judges, and could not be removed either by the Crown or the Company, was unusual, and might be fairly deemed objectionable.* But to suppose that within the space of four years, and under the control of Parliament and public opinion, such a use was likely be made of the Indian patronage as would destroy the legitimate influence of the Crown, and insure the permanent triumph of Mr. Fox's party, appears extravagant and unreasonable.† In the first Session of the new Parliament Mr. Pitt introduced his India Bill, which was carried by a majority of 271 to 60; this Bill, by creating a Ministerial Board of Control for the affairs of India, established the system of 'double Government,' which has now existed for seventy years, and which was deli-

* A protest, formally signed by Lord Rockingham, the Duke of Portland, Lord Fitzwilliam, and other peers, which was much quoted at the time, contained the following passage: 'The election of executive officers in Parliament is plainly unconstitutional, and an example of the most pernicious kind, productive of intrigue and faction, and calculated for extending a corrupt influence in the Crown. It frees Ministers from responsibility, while it leaves them all the effect of patronage.' (See *Adolphus*, vol. iv. p. 59.)

† See Lord J. Russell's remarks on Fox's India Bill, vol. iii. pp. 96-100. A good summary of the objections made to it at the time is given in Tomline's Life of Pitt, vol. i. pp. 192-201.

berately continued, with certain amendments, in the last Session of Parliament.

While the great struggle between Pitt and Fox after the dismissal of the Coalition Ministry was going on, the King's anxiety was great; and in his private letters to Mr. Pitt he recurred to his former intention of seeking a refuge in Hanover from the intolerable pressure of his Parliamentary foes. On receiving the account of the first defeats which awaited Mr. Pitt upon his re-election, the King wrote to him as follows:—
 'I am ready to take any step that may be proposed to oppose this faction, and to struggle to the last period of my life; but I can never submit to throw myself into its power. If they, in the end, succeed, *my line is a clear one, and to which I have fortitude enough to submit.*'* About the same time he addressed Mr. Pitt in a similar strain upon an impending motion in the House of Lords:—'Should not the Lords stand boldly forth, this Constitution must soon be changed; for if the two only privileges of the Crown be infringed,—that of negating Bills which have passed both Houses of Parliament, and that of naming the Ministers to be employed, I cannot but feel, as far as regards my person, that *I can be no longer of utility to this country, nor can with honour continue in this island.*' 'From this extract,' says Tomline, 'coupled with the conclusion of his former letter, as well as from other authorities, it is evident that the King had at this time serious intentions of retiring to Hanover, in case Mr. Fox and his party should prevail.'†

No such painful necessity, however, awaited the King. The fatal error of his great adversary, the dexterity of his secret counsellors, and the consummate parliamentary ability of his young Minister, gave him a signal triumph. Fox had emerged a victor out of the long struggle of the American war: he had passed the King under the yoke, and made him submit to a Ministry which he hated. But he could not convert a victory into a conquest: he had the force which enabled him to defeat, he had not the longsighted and patient prudence which could alone enable him to subjugate. By the unhappy Coalition he

* Tomline's Life of Pitt, vol. i. p. 271. In a letter to Mr. Pitt, of Feb. 15. 1784, the King used the following terms respecting Mr. Fox: 'Mr. Pitt is so well apprised of the mortification I feel at any possibility of ever again seeing the heats of Opposition in public employments, and more particularly Mr. Fox, whose conduct has not been more marked against my station in the empire, than against my person; that he must attribute my want of perspicuity, &c.' (Ibid. p. 396.)

† Ib. p. 341.

lost everything: he threw away his popularity, he destroyed his party, he weakened his moral authority, and he made an opening for the formation of a new combination, which speedily predominated in both Houses of Parliament. As it was said of Napoleon that he was the heir of the Revolution, so it may be said of Pitt that he was the heir of the Coalition. At the critical moment, he was able to satisfy the conditions of the practical problem, which had for so many years remained unsolved. Lord North had, during his twelve years' Ministry, been the favourite of the Crown, but after a time he lost the support of the country. Mr. Fox, up to the Coalition, was warmly supported by the country, but the King would not endure him. In Mr. Pitt was at last found a Minister whom the King would tolerate and the country would support. His Administration, when once formed, could not be shaken by Fox's opposition. It weathered the storm of the Regency, by the King's timely recovery; and the results of the French Revolution gave it additional strength. At last, it fell by an intrigue of secret advisers who alarmed the Protestant conscience of the King: it was stabbed by an assassin in the dark, not overthrown by the blows of Fox's broadsword in fair and open parliamentary warfare. Like most great political contests in this country, the contest between George III. and Mr. Fox ended in a compromise. The compromise was effected in the person of Mr. Pitt.* Mr. Pitt was too unbending to become an instrument in the King's hands, and had too much principle to lend himself, like Lord North, to a policy of which he disapproved. On the other hand, the King was grateful to Pitt for rescuing him from the hands of Fox: he endured and almost liked him, though he ultimately tripped him up. Pitt's ascendancy in Parliament was maintained by his own talents and conduct, and by the personal confidence which he inspired, not by the influence of the Crown,

* On Lord Rockingham's death, Pitt expressed his concern to Mr. Fox under the gallery, at the report that Government would break up. Fox said, "it would, and the whole system be revived," adding, "they look to you; without you they cannot succeed; with you I know not whether they will or no." "If," replied Pitt, "they reckon upon me, they may find themselves mistaken." Fox, as he left the House, repeated this to Lord John Townshend, and Lord Maitland (afterwards Lauderdale), and probably many others; and both Townshend and Lauderdale told it me. Fox added, "I believe they do reckon on Pitt, and I believe they will not be mistaken." (*Lord Holland, in Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 446.) Neither of the parties in this curious dialogue were quite right in their anticipations.

or the support of the King's friends. In this manner the conflicting elements, which Fox could not harmonise, were reconciled.

Lord John thus sums up the effects of the Coalition, and the disruption of the Whig party, which that measure of apparent union produced : —

' Thus was broken and dispersed, by its own dissensions, that great confederacy of freedom which, nurtured in the adversity of the American war, had revived the ancient virtues of Whiggism, and made the Senate shine with the lights of patriotism and eloquence. Thus vanished the hope of seeing a more brilliant Fox and a more consistent Pitt; the one advising and advising his country in the conduct of foreign affairs, which he, above all men, understood; and the other applying to the management of our finances the economical principles of Smith, and the wise frugality of Sully. The Coalition prevented a consummation so desirable. * * * The rout of the Whig party, the Pitt Administration, and the war of the French Revolution were the results of this fatal event.' (Vol. ii. p. 91.)

The life of Mr. Fox is brought down in these volumes to the year 1792; the Buckingham Papers reach as far as 1799; and both works contain much curious and authentic information respecting the Regency debates in 1788-9: but the length to which this Article has already extended prevents us from following the events of that period in detail; we can only remark that much light is thrown upon it by both publications. •

The period of our history from the decline of the American war to the commencement of Mr. Pitt's long Administration, is full of instruction with respect to the working of our Parliamentary Constitution. It was not, in fact, definitively and clearly established until the year 1784, that where there is a conflict between the personal opinions of the sovereign and those of a majority of the House of Commons, the latter, and not the former, is to prevail; unless, indeed, a dissolution and a new election should reverse the decision of the previous Parliament.* The lessons which this portion of our annals teaches are manifold; but it throws especial light on the two points which appear to us to form the characteristic difficulties of that form of Government which is commonly known by the appellation of 'limited monarchy'; that is to say, a hereditary King, associated with a parliamentary body. These are, 1. The desire of the King to govern as well as to reign, and his attempts, open or concealed, to defeat the policy of the Ministers in whom the majority of the Parliament, for the time being, confides.

* On the constitutional right of the Crown to dissolve Parliament in this state of things, see the authoritative remark of Lord J. Russell (vol. ii. p. 245.).

2. The envies and rivalries of the parliamentary chiefs; their impatience of a superior, or even of an equal; their unwillingness to co-operate for public objects, on account of their separate pretensions and personal ambition; and the consequent facility afforded to the King of ruling by division, of fomenting their discords and animosities, and ultimately, perhaps, of reducing them all to impotence and silence.* Parliamentary leaders of parties, in their more contracted sphere, are likely to indulge the feelings which animated the great party leaders of Rome in their contest for the mastery of the world,—

‘Nec quemquam jam ferre potest, Cæsarve priorem,
Pompeiusve parem.’

But there is this important difference in their respective situations, that, whereas Pompey and Cæsar contended which should be chief, parliamentary leaders, who act singly, and embroil everything with mutual jealousies, end by being all put down under the feet of one common master.

We have no space now to dwell upon this theme at the length which it requires, but we wish that our feeble voice could induce the leaders of popular parties on the Continent to gather from our history the warnings which it contains with respect to the working of a parliamentary system. If the great Powers should continue at peace; if the quiet development of wealth and industry, and the amicable relations of individuals in society, should be permitted to advance without the interruption of destructive violence; we cannot believe that the fairest and most civilised portions of Continental Europe will remain under purely despotic forms of government. The trial of the American model, which has been made in some European States, has not proved successful; and though we are far from being exclusive in our attachment to constitutional forms, and

* Aristotle enumerates want of mutual confidence as one of the three great means by which the Greek despots maintained their power. (Pol. v. 11.) The impatience of equals is well denoted in the expressive Greek term, τὸ φιλόπρωτον.

Mr. Fox, in a letter of May 1782, expresses a fear that Pitt will attempt to revive the system of governing by the influence of the Crown, and in defiance of the independent portion of Parliament. He then proceeds to say:—‘I feel myself, I own, rather inclined to rely upon his understanding and integrity for resisting all the temptations of ambition, and especially of *being first*, which I know will be industriously thrown in his way, and contrasted with that secondary and subordinate situation, to which they will insinuate he must be confined while he continues to act in the general system.’ (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 325.)

are quite willing to admit that a system of government which is suited to England may not be suited to countries differently situated; we still think that, whenever the pressure of the despotic regimen is at all relaxed,—looking to the fact that man is a historical animal—the parliamentary form of government, combined with a hereditary king, offers the best chance of permanent amelioration in the existing circumstances of the European States. If the time should ever arrive when an attempt should be made in the great Continental States to reach a popular system of government by this road, we earnestly exhort the parliamentary leaders to bear in mind, that the first object to be secured is *some* form of parliamentary or corporate government, *some* species of rule which is not dependent on the will of one man, but which lodges the supreme power in a body; *some* constitution which ensures public debate in a legislative chamber, freedom of the press, and security against arbitrary imprisonment. When this great and paramount object has been accomplished; and a habit of regular government, upon these principles, has been formed, the time will have arrived for deciding the proportions of the aristocratic and democratic elements in the constitution; and for raising questions on which the anti-despotic party are likely to be divided. But it is premature to stir those questions, and to dwell upon the refinements of a free Government, the *apices* of a constitutional system, before its foundations have been laid. It is premature to dispute about accidents before we have secured the substance. The leaders of liberal parties should bear in mind that despotism is the normal state of mankind, and free governments the rare exception; and that, in all unsettled states of society, the tendency to a despotic form of government is strong and constant.

We have made these remarks with a view to the future, not to the past; not for the purpose of blaming the popular leaders in the late movements on the Continent, but for the purpose of exhorting them to a different course hereafter. Much wonder has been expressed at the failure of parliamentary government in the recent experiments in the Continental States: and an opinion has even been promulgated that the Anglo-Saxon race are alone fitted for free institutions. The Republican Governments of antiquity and the middle ages—which, whatever may have been their defects, were the best Governments of their respective times—prove that Free Government is not the monopoly of a privileged race: and the failure of the late attempts may, as it seems to us, be completely explained by the neglect of those precautions which an intelligent study of the history of England during the reign of George the Third is calculated to suggest.

ART. II.—1. *Annual Report of the Blind School, St. George's Fields.* 1853.

2. *Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Wharncliffe on the Phonetic System for the Blind.* By J. H. FRERE, Esq. 1843.

3. *Annual Report of the Pennsylvanian Institution for the Instruction of the Blind.*

4. *Tangible Typography, or how the Blind read.* By E. C. JOHNSON, Esq. 1853.

5. *The Lost Senses.* By J. KITTO. (1845.)

6. *Observations on different Modes of Educating the Blind.* By Rev. W. TAYLOR, F.R.S. 1853.

7. *A History of France for Children.* By Lord CRANBORNE.*

8. *Des Aveugles. Considérations sur leur Etat Physique, Moral et Intellectuel.* Par P. A. DUFAU. Paris: 1850.

‘No man becomes blind,’ says the proverb, ‘by merely shutting his eyes; nor does a fool always see by opening them.’ Yet, in spite of Sancho and the proverb, when we think or reason about the blind, we are apt to judge of them as simply having their eyes shut, while we have our’s open; and that therein lies the great difference between us. This is but a hundredth part of the difference.

‘Eyes and No-eyes,’ says didactic Mr. Mavor, ‘made together a tour, in which Eyes saw everything, and No-eyes nothing;’ notwithstanding which stern truth No-eyes was not a blind man—certainly not Mr. Holmar, who, in spite of total blindness, has visited and described half the known countries of the world. Let us further illustrate the case from life. Mr. Onesimus Smith has for a neighbour Mr. Cassio Brown. Mr. Smith caught a cold in his eyes some six or seven years after his first appearance in the Smithian halls, and became totally blind; while his neighbour Brown’s eyes are still, at forty, as keen as a hawk’s, and scorn the aid of glasses. It is a winter evening, and Mr. Brown sits reading in his library. He has mastered three chapters of metaphysics, and now closes his eyes for a moment to ponder on the last and toughest. As his bodily eyes close, his mental eyes open; and the very objects which he but now beheld, reappear almost as they fade away.† He still sees

* Lord Cranborne, since childhood, has been totally blind.

† Malebranche, when he wished to think intensely, used to close his window-shutters in the daytime, excluding every ray of light;

the printed page which he was reading a minute ago; opposite, over the fire-place, still appears to hang that incomparable likeness of himself as the President of the Little Pedlington Archery Club, in full uniform; he can still *see* the ruddy fire as well as hear it crackle, and the shadow on the wall still flickers in the uncertain light. On whichever of these points his thoughts chance to dwell — metaphysics, archery, his own noble mien as President, the price of coals, or the theory of shadows — of that very one may his eyes, though closely shut, still behold a visible symbol: ‘Non cernenda sibi lumina clausa vident.’

But suppose Mr. O. Smith under precisely similar circumstances, save that he is blind. He too reads metaphysics, and is given to meditation. He leans back in his chair, and thinks on the last tough chapter. He has been blind since he was eight years old, and is now forty. He cannot remember, with any accuracy, the shapes of the thousand objects of sight which greet the traveller through little Pedlington, though he can with ease find his way through every part of the village. He knows where to turn off from the main road to the stile across the fields, precisely where the pump stands outside Firkins the grocer’s door; and can even *run* without danger through the paternal mansion of the Smiths. He is well acquainted with all the details of the room in which he sits, can find almost any one volume that is wanted, and is aware of the portrait over the fire-place.* But when he leans back to muse on that last tough chapter of metaphysics, no sudden change takes place further than *this*, that a minute ago he was reading, *now* he is thinking, or not, as the case may chance.

But no visions of shadows on the wall, of printed type, or

and, for a like reason, Democritus *is said* to have put out his eyes in order that he might philosophise the better; — which latter story, however, it should be observed, though told by several ancient writers, is doubted by Cicero (*De Fin.* v. 39.), and discredited by Plutarch (*De Curiosit.* c. 12.) Speaking on this point, M. Dufau (the Manager of the famous French Schools) says, — ‘Lorsque nous voulons ajouter accidentellement à notre force habituelle d’attention, nous fermons les yeux, nous nous faisons artificiellement aveugles. Diderot tenait souvent en parlant les yeux entièrement clos, et sa parole avait alors, au dire de la Harpe, une éloquence qui s’élevait quelquefois jusqu’au sublime.’

* There is now living in the county of York a gentleman of fortune, who, though totally blind, is an expert archer: ‘so expert,’ says our informant (who knows him well) ‘that out of twenty shots with the long bow he was far my superior. *His sense of hearing was so keen, that when a boy behind the target rang a bell, the blind archer knew precisely how to aim the shaft.*’

page, of portrait, or of archery, are ready to spring up at a moment's notice to be scanned, or dismissed as intruders. Blank night shuts him on all sides as he reads; it still shuts him in when he has ceased to read. Of the very light, in which live all the rest of the world, he most probably can form little, if any, conception, but from its genial warmth as the sun greets him in his morning walk, or dies along the elm-tree avenue as he strolls at eventide through his father's park.

If his thoughts stray for a moment from metaphysics to the crackling *sound* of his fire, his mental vision may at once form such idea as it can of blazing coals, but it has no help in the conception from aught of the visible, external world. 'The world of the blind,' says Prescott, 'is circumscribed by the little circle which they can span with their own arms. All beyond has for them no real existence.' (*Essays*, p. 47.)

A man who has been blind from birth or even early childhood fails in realising even what light is, much less a blazing flame. In the same way he fails to realise, even remotely, descriptions of the stars, the starry heavens at night, the sun, the moon. He has scarcely any idea of distance; such words as '*the arched canopy of heaven*,' which *seeing* men call boundless, convey to him, after all, but a vague and dreamy idea of space and distance, but not even a faint conception of the glorious spectacle which delights his fellow-men.

So again, of the sea he can form no accurate conception. 'I have been told,' said a poor blind man to us not long since, 'that the ocean is like an immense green field; but of what use is that? How do I know what a *field* is, or what *green* is?' (A blind companion had used this simile in trying to make him understand what the sea was like.) The words 'sea' and 'sky' therefore do not convey to the blind man the impression which they convey to us. *His* world, so to speak, is without sky or sea; but of such a world *we* can form no idea. The picture, therefore, now before Mr. Smith, however vague or imperfect, comes to him when summoned; but is the result rather of inward power than outward impression. He has no remembrance of the fire at which he burnt his fingers in the nursery some five and thirty years ago, save that it was hot and painful. He may remember sitting as a boy on the bench under the great walnut tree, but he cannot now call to mind even its colour, shape, or size; and still more faint is his remembrance of that striking portrait of Onesimus Smith, Sen., Esq., major in the Yorkshire Invincibles, which still hangs where his son was held up in nurse's arms to see it on the walnut wainscot of the dining-room. But it must not be forgotten, that although the

circle of which Prescott speaks is a narrow one, yet within that circuit the blind student has full sway, and that nothing is too distant for his intellect to gather even from far-off sources, and bring within his own range. Whatever object, therefore, rises in his thoughts to interfere with the metaphysical musings, rises up from within; and the very fact of its being thus isolated from the external world tends to render the mental vision, if not keener, yet more concentrated; as the rays of common light gathered into a focus burn the hand on which the hottest July sun shines harmlessly.

And thus it happens, that — on whatever subject — the blind man thinks with greater concentration and individuality of purpose than the student who has eyes; if he loses the help of external objects in forming certain conceptions or ideas, he gains by not being liable to their intrusion in tangible and solid reality, when not wanted.

How imperfectly, and with what difficulty, the blind realise space and distance, even if their sight be restored, may be seen from the following most interesting case, extracted from the 'Philosophical Transactions:' —

'The boy born blind, upon whom Cheselden so successfully operated, believed, when first he saw, that the objects touched his eyes, as the things which he felt touched his skin; consequently he had no idea of distance. He did not know the form of any object, nor could he distinguish one object from another, however different their figure or size might be: when objects were shown to him which he had known formerly by the touch, he looked at them with attention, and observed them carefully, in order to know them again; but as he had too many objects to retain at once, he forgot the greater part of them; and when he first learned, as he said, to see and know objects, he forgot a thousand for one that he recollected. It was two months before he discovered that pictures represented solid bodies; until that time he had considered them as planes and surfaces differently coloured, and diversified by a variety of shades; but when he began to conceive that these pictures represented solid bodies, in touching the canvas of a picture with his hand, he expected to find something in reality solid upon it: and he was much astonished when, on touching those parts which seemed round and unequal, he found them flat and smooth like the rest. He asked which was the sense that deceived him, the sight or the touch? There was shown to him a little portrait of his father, which was in the case of his mother's watch; he said that he knew very well that it was the resemblance of his father; but he asked, with great

‘astonishment, how it was possible for so large a visage to be kept in so small a space? as that appeared to him as impossible as that a bushel could be contained in a pint.’

It is but natural, therefore, to find that the blind, as a class, when once they have been roused to exertion, and their education has been really commenced, even in every day practical life act with greater individuality and concentration of purpose than many *cleverer* friends who have eyes. If neglected, and left alone, they will doubtless stagnate in mind and body. The darkness surrounding the body seems to penetrate and pervade the mind; and not only does it appear to them that the day is over, and the night come when none may work, but that the sun is set, and that there can be no moon or stars to govern the night.

But only once convince the blind man that He who made the day made also the night—that very night in which he lives and is to work—show to him but one star of hope—point out to him but one work which he can and ought to do—make your demonstration practical, and show that the work proposed can be done by him—raise in short one spark of interest in what the hand or the head is to do, and it will soon be done with might and earnestness. The one solitary, dim spark will increase in brilliancy and size; soon other stars will dawn upon the sight where but now was darkness, as each heaviest, darkest cloud ‘Unfolds her silver lining to the night,’ and the whole heaven soon glows with innumerable points of fire.

But to return to the prose reality of the matter, and cut short our moonlit walk. When one point of interest is thoroughly roused in the mind of a blind child of whatever age, the work quickly progresses, whatever that point of interest be. It may chance to be in the art of making a basket, or a pair of shoes; in the learning of a psalm, or the art of using a knife; it may be of walking uprightly, or finding his way through the asylum into which he is received, from room to room of his new home. It matters little where the interest is first roused, provided it be real, and is at once cherished into active life and exertion. Much will depend on the habit and disposition of the learner, his previous mode of life, his parents’ occupation, ignorance and poverty, neglect or care of their child.

One boy will, we find, learn in a month what it takes another a year to acquire, and which perhaps a third is never able to acquire. Outside one of the workshops in St. George’s Fields is a long covered pathway for the use of the pupils in wet weather, and on it may be often seen some forty or fifty boys and men promenading with as much ease and regularity in twos,

and threes as if they had the keenest sight. At a second glance, however, you will see that here and there in the crowd are one or two who, if they lose the arm of their companions, are at once in great difficulty. The new comers are to be distinguished at the first glance. They stoop much, and walk with a shambling, shuffling step, as if in fear and dread of suddenly meeting some unseen obstacle, and so coming down with a crash. Yet it is not so with all the new comers. One, a smart active boy, who perhaps has had companions at home, learns in a few days the exact line of the covered way, never swerves from it, nor wanders into the wrong side of the path so as to interfere with the stream going in the other direction, though his fellow-pupil admitted at the same time cannot walk five yards alone without fear and trembling. Another learns to run, cleverly, from one angle of the building to another, as if his fingers saw the handle of the door which they so readily and exactly find; while a fourth for many months never gets out of a zigzag when he tries to walk alone, and is certain to fall if he attempts to run.

A similar difference exists among them in the acquirement of any art or knowledge. The blind boy *generally* excels in some one special department. Thus, the clever basket-maker is no musician; he persists in singing G while the organ strongly exhorts him to sing A, and yet hears no discord; while his companion, who entered the school with him, and can sing and play scales major and minor from A to Z, elaborates the tenth part of a basket in a month, and in great misery cuts his finger when he should be splitting a withy or chipping off an irregular and stray end at the edge of his work.

But whichever phase of character A. or B. presents, the one favourite pursuit is carried on with zeal and diligence. If B. has strong intentions of outbasketing all other framers of twigs, A. threatens to become a second Handel, and C., who prides himself on his powers of memory and mental calculation, bids fair to make mnemonic Major Beniowski retire from Bow Street in despair.* Zeal and diligence may, therefore, be noticed as

* This characteristic faculty is, according to Father Charlevoix, turned to good account in Japan, where the public records of the empire are committed to memory by chosen blind men.

We are ourselves acquainted with an old blind mat-maker, who can repeat Thomson's 'Seasons,' and one or two other long poems, besides having an almost equally ready knowledge of several of the Gospels. Very recently a son was added to a friend's family, and news of the birth was brought to the blind man, who instantly set about calculating how often the child's birthday would fall on a

special characteristics of the blind who are being *educated* in a true sense. Many of them, too, possess that spark of what, at first sight, appears like vanity, but is an essential element in the composition of all men who attain any degree of skill, whether in the making of an osier basket or in ruling a great nation.

Every man, when once any one power of mind has been thoroughly trained and is ready for action—if he be really *in earnest*—feels and knows in his own heart that he possesses this power. He knows that he *can* do, and therefore does. Like the poet—the true ποιητής, *doer or maker*—he too feels

‘The energy divine within him shined
Bid every glowing thought in *actum* live.’

In such as these it appears as a high and noble self-consciousness of real living power within them, widely differing from mere empty vanity. Vanity sees nothing higher or greater than self. The true consciousness of power is not a confession of self, but of Him who made man, and placed in him the power to act and to feel conscious of the power; and that from Him comes the power, whether to make baskets or rule empires, to weave a door-mat, or

‘To melt the soul to very tears of joy,
With never-ending waves of melody
From Music’s deep, unfathomed sea.’ *

How nobly Milton realised this, and in his days of darkness felt and owned the presence of a Power greater than himself, may be seen in the following grand words:—‘Et sane haud ultima Dei cura cæci sumus; qui nos, quominus quicquam aliud præter ipsum cernere valemus, eo clementius atque benignius respicere dignatur. Nos ab injuriis hominum non modo incolumes, sed pene sacros divina lex reddidit, divinus favor; nec tam oculorum *habitudine quam calstrum alarum umbrâ* has nobis fecisse tenebras videtur; factas illustrare rursus interiore ac longe præstabiliore lumine haud raro solet.’ (*Defens. Secund.*) That the gloom of the blind man’s life

Monday up to the year 1900. In a short time he had accurately settled the matter. He is now, though upwards of sixty, trying to learn to read. But his fingers are become hard and horny with work.

* ‘There is in the heart of all men a working principle,—call it ambition, or vanity, or desire of distinction, the inseparable adjunct of our individuality and personal nature, and flowing from the same source as language,—the instinct and necessity in each man of declaring his particular existence, and thus of singularising himself.’ (*Coleridge’s Omniana*, p. 375.)

should not be from mere dulness of vision, but rather 'from the shadow of the Divine wings' which overspread him, is indeed a conception worthy of Milton himself.

We do not, of course, assert that the blind, as a class, possess this noble self-consciousness in a greater degree than, but only in common with, other men. In them as in others empty vanity may usurp its place; but on the whole we imagine that the higher tone is not unfrequent, and is one secret of their success, though casual observers are apt to call it the result of mere cleverness.

There is an idea, we believe, extant among persons that the blind as a class are inferior in actual power of mind* as well as in attainment; as if with their eyes their mental faculties had also become blinded—that a sort of blight had passed over the powers of mind, destroying at once both keenness and vigour. People are apt to say, 'O he is blind,' just as they say, 'he is an idiot.' It would be easy to prove the injustice of such words at once, but we prefer leaving plain facts to speak for themselves in a future page of these remarks. It is sufficient here to say that the idea is altogether erroneous, arising from ignorance of the facts of the case, or a knowledge of the blind derived only from books.

If we sum up the characteristics of the blind as a class†, we shall find them to be thoughtful and diligent, with peculiar keenness and sensibility of mind and feeling; shy of expressing their thoughts or feelings before strangers; grateful for every little kindness, and equally tenacious in the remembrance of the least slight; not seldom conceited and opinionated. They are affectionate to one another, and to any who will take an interest in their cares or pleasures. One peculiarity—not to be forgotten—is, that they hate to be compassionated,—to be supposed to be so frightfully different from other people.

'*Pity the poor Blind*' is the cry of the professional mendicant who haunts the kerbstone behind a dog. His blindness is his stock in trade,—at once his misfortune and his most excellent property; though even in his case one's pity is all in vain until

* This idea Dufau contradicts strongly, even in the case of those born blind:—'*C'est toutefois un fait bien digne de remarque que la défecuosité de l'instrument intellectuel chez les aveugles-nés ne dépasse presque jamais certaines limites. On a observé qu'il est fort rare qu'ils soient atteints sinon d'imbécillité du moins de folie.*'

† '*En somme,*' says Dufau, '*l'attention, la comparaison, et le raisonnement, l'abstraction, l'analyse et la mémoire, tous les élémens de la raison humaine sont en eux comme en nous; pas un n'y manque.*' (P. 47.) *

it assume a metallic form and drop into the canine basket.¹ But the poor blind who are once placed above being tempted to this degradation do not like being lamented over with pitiful tears or words, or compassionated with sentimentalities. They will gladly listen if you take an interest in what they do, and talk to them as workers of an ordinary kind. But they feel that they are of the same flesh and blood as you are, and you must identify yourself with them if you would hear of their difficulties, successes, joys, and troubles. Otherwise the task will be one of difficulty, and unproductive of the least intimacy.

So keenly do they feel their oneness with other people, and so disinclined are they in general to allude, even remotely, to their own loss of sight, that among blind children such phrases as the following are constantly exchanged:—‘Have you *seen* Martha Smith?’ ‘I *saw* Robert in the basket shop.’ ‘Sarah, have you *seen* my bonnet? (here the chapel bell rings); just *see* if it is in your room.’ As may be therefore imagined, they take great interest in listening to descriptions of many circumstances and things which it appears at first thought persons without sight could not at all realise. We happen to know that the pupils of the Blind School in St. George’s Fields listened with great interest to several very lengthy printed accounts of the funeral pageant of the Great Duke. Many of them also visited the Great Exhibition, and were delighted with the wonders of the place, of which they still talk.* Of this thoughtful and ingenious race of people there are in Great Britain about twenty-five thousand†, of whom a small proportion, certainly not one half, are being educated, as the majority of the whole number belong to an indigent class for whom little has been attempted, and still less has been done. Shut

* Our readers will perhaps be surprised to learn that the blind were exhibitors at the world’s mart; a large stand being entirely filled with their work in rugs, mats, and baskets, besides knitting in wool and silk, and hair-work of the finest kinds.

† Golownin’s estimate of the number of blind persons in Japan appears to us impossibly large; he sets down 36,000 to the capital, Jeddo, alone!

The proportion of the blind to the whole population is rather higher in America than in Europe. In Egypt the average is still higher, probably on account of ophthalmia; being computed to amount to *one blind person in every hundred*; in Norway, one in a thousand; in Great Britain rather less than in Norway. All the blind do not seem to feel their privation with equal acuteness; different causes of blindness seeming to involve different degrees of suffering; those born blind feeling their loss far less deeply than others who can form a *real idea of vision*.

out as the blind are from the thousand channels of information and improvement open to the rest of mankind in the world of books, of course the first object has been to teach them to read, especially to read the Scriptures. For unfortunately scarcely any other book has yet been brought within the reach of the poor blind. We say unfortunately, because *The Book* of all books has by this means been subjected to much usage—to which any book may be degraded—at once unbecoming and unworthy of its sacred character and contents.

'*The Scriptures*,' says the author of '*Tangible Typography*,' (a work which we gladly recommend to our readers' careful perusal) 'are now read more frequently as an exercise, and a means for mastering a system, than as a spiritual comfort, guide, and consolation: especially in schools, where portions of the Bible are used as the only class book, and where, consequently, monotony begetting indifference, and indifference want of respect, the reading of the Word of God is apt to be regarded as a task, rather than a pleasure and a privilege.' (P. 8.)

And again,—'The books printed for their use are few in number, deficient in variety, and not procured without difficulty even at a large expense.' (*Ibid.*)

'The blind are almost entirely without works of interest or amusement.' (*Ibid.*)

It is evident, therefore, that much remains to be done before the blind, as a class, can be raised from their present dark and dreary condition. Two thirds of the *twenty-five thousand* in England cannot yet read (p. 10.), and those who can have their small library rendered still smaller by the multiplicity of systems on which the books have been printed. These systems are, it appears, so utterly different from each other as to require separate and special study before they can be deciphered. Learning a new system is, in fact, to a blind man, like learning a new language. That our readers may the more readily understand this, we propose giving a brief sketch of the different systems now in use among the blind in Great Britain; and then as briefly noticing what else has been done for them in other matters of mental and bodily education.

All printing for the blind is in *raised*, or, as it is called, *embossed* type, at once perceptible to the touch. The different systems may be subdivided into two distinct classes, which have been severally named *Arbitrary* and *Alphabetical*; the first in which arbitrary characters are used to represent letters, sounds, or words, and the second in which the ordinary Roman letters are employed.

Modifications of the two great classes of Systems may be thus subdivided:—

*Alphabetical.**

1. Alston's system.
2. The American.
3. French alphabetical.
4. Alston modified.

Arbitrary.

1. Lucas's system.
2. Frere's system.
3. Moon's.
4. Le Système Braille.
5. Le Système Carton.

Of the alphabetical systems Alston's is the chief and best. 'After long experience,' writes the adapter, Mr. Alston of Glasgow, 'I am convinced that arbitrary characters, however ingeniously constructed, throw unnecessary obstacles in the way of the blind.' He therefore chose the ordinary Roman capital letters, as being at once the simplest, and most easily felt,—the most likely to be *remembered* by any blind scholar who had once enjoyed sight; in which, too, any one with sight, able to read ordinary type, could with ease instruct those deprived of the use of their eyes. The importance of this latter advantage cannot, we imagine, be over-estimated; and we are bound to admit that Mr. Alston's choice of the Roman letters is, on the whole, a wise one. At p. 35-36. of Mr. Johnson's valuable little work, we find the following *reasons why* Alston's, as now in use, or slightly modified, is the system best suited for general adoption:—

'The blind already form a peculiar and distinct class of people, and it is most desirable on every account not to render them more isolated or peculiar, but rather to make them, as far as may be, one in advantages, duties, and enjoyments with their fellow-men. The

* One most curious and ingenious system of writing and reading is that of a knotted string, invented some years since by two blind men then in the Edinburgh School. We have but space to note that the letters are on this system divided into seven classes, each class and each letter being represented by a knot or knots of a peculiar kind, easily distinguished by the touch. The system is obviously more curious than useful. It would be an interesting task to compare it with the '*Quipos*,' or *knotted records*, anciently kept by the Peruvians, before the era of Spanish discovery.

In the system of *raised* characters first adopted for the use of the blind, the Illyrian or Sclavonian alphabet was employed, probably on account of the *square form* of the letters, for this reason more easily detected. These soon gave way to solid letters (Roman) of wood which were made to slide into a frame.

Archbishop Usher tells us of his being thus taught to read by two blind aunts.

system of embossed printing for their use, therefore, should embrace at least the following features:—

‘1. It must resemble as nearly as possible the type in ordinary use among those who have eye-sight;

‘(a) that the blind scholar, in learning to read, may have every possible help from words which he *may* have formerly *seen*; but which *now* his fingers must decipher:

‘(b) that he may derive help in learning from any one who can read an ordinary book; or, if needful, that his friend may be able to read to him.

‘2. It must present the words correctly spelt in full, that when he learns to write, he may do so in a correct manner which *others* can read.

‘3. The raised characters must be clear, sharp, and well-defined, which the finger, hardened by long work, and the keen soft touch of the little child, may be alike able to discern.

‘The only system which can ever offer such advantages as these must clearly be some modification of Alston’s system, or the lower-case type.’ (P. 36.)

To the same effect speaks the Rev. W. Taylor of York, probably one of the highest authorities on all points connected with the blind. ‘No alphabet,’ he says, ‘*seeming to possess so many advantages as the Roman alphabet.*’ ‘I would discourage all systems of *embossing*,’ says Mr. Hughes, the Governor of the Blind School at Manchester, ‘*which could not be read and taught by seeing persons.*’ And to a like purport writes Mr. Morris, the Superintendent of the Blind School at York.

The American books are all printed on a modification of Alston’s system, and are a strong testimony on its behalf; while the words of the famous Abbé Carton speak in its favour still more strongly. The Abbé is the Governor of ‘L’Institution des Sourds-muets, et des Aveugles,’ at Bruges, and having devoted a long life to the study of the blind, must be admitted as a valuable authority. He thus writes:—‘En effet, si un caractère, connu des clairvoyants, est employé dans l’impression en relief pour les aveugles, ces infortunés sont plus rapprochés des autres hommes que s’ils se servaient d’un caractère inconnu de ceux qui les entourent; quoiqu’on en dise, il nous en coûte d’apprendre un nouvel alphabet pour l’enseigner à des enfants, et cette difficulté rebuttera plusieurs personnes qui, sans cela, se seraient occupées de cet enseignement. Diminuer la difficulté qu’auraient les clairvoyants à connaître l’alphabet des aveugles, est réellement travailler en faveur des aveugles. Le plus grand nombre d’aveugles se trouve parmi la classe pauvre, et le plus grand malheur des aveugles est leur isolement;

‘ tous nos efforts doivent tendre à les rapprocher de nous, et à rendre leur instruction aussi semblable à la nôtre qu’il est possible, et à commencer cette instruction aussi vite que l’on peut.’

One would imagine that such testimony as this was sufficient to decide any question the settlement of which depended on common sense and reason. But, strange to say, such is far from being the case. It is not even yet decided that one of the alphabetical systems shall be adopted. It appears indeed settled that the blind, as a class, shall be educated, and, as a first step, shall be taught to read. But eager and unwearied partisans are disputing on the very threshold of the work *how* the blind shall be taught,—‘ *Whether,*’ says Tangle Typography, ‘ *by Brown’s infallible stenographic, Smith’s unrivalled abbreviations, Jones’s unsurpassed contractions, Robinson’s easy symbols, or any other of the numerous perfect systems which, unfortunately for the blind, have been lately invented.*’ And meanwhile, the work for which all are striving is greatly impeded. The strength and success which unity of purpose and of action alone can give, are wanting; and the education of the blind is impeded.

The American Books are all printed on a modification of Alston’s plan, and, as a whole, may be regarded as successful, being smaller in bulk and cheaper in cost than those published in England. The type adopted is clear and sharp, being a slight modification of what printers call lower-case. Further notice it scarcely needs from us, as the books are not to be procured in England.

The books printed by M. Dufau*, at the great Institution for the Blind at Paris, before the employment of an arbitrary system of dots, were rounded lower-case letters with Roman capitals, and, in the Jurors’ Report of the May Exhibition, are highly spoken of. But that type has been abandoned, and an arbitrary one of raised dots adopted in its place, apparently without cause, and with little success.

Lucas’s System professes to do for the blind reader what shorthand would do for one who, ignorant of the ordinary alphabet,

* M. Dufau is the author of a most valuable work on the blind, entitled ‘Des Aveugles. Considérations sur leur état physique, moral et intellectuel,’ which, we regret to say, has reached us only too late to be of service while writing the following pages. A few brief notes is all that it now lies in our power to give by way of extract. His work is dedicated to the Crown Prince of Hanover, who is totally blind.

should attempt a stenographic one. (The case of an ordinary short-hand writer who can read and write in the manner of ordinary mortals is not an analogous one.) We are, however, surprised to find that short-hand for the blind, contrary to all other stenographic systems, is no saver of *space*. The New Testament, printed in the American type, occupies 430 pages, in Alston's system, 623, in Lucas's, 841. Whatever, therefore, Lucas omits, his omissions serve to increase the bulk of his productions. '*Minuendo auget*,' would be a good Lucasian motto.

'All letters,' says Lucas, 'not necessary to the sound are omitted; as *da* for *day*, *mit* for *might*, *no* for *know*,' &c. Now, allowing the first of these omissions to pass muster, it does not seem to have struck the Lucasian brain that *mit* spells *mit* quite as much as *nught*, unless he abolish all *mitten*s, *mittimus*, and *mitigations* by stenographic decree. For our own part, we become tenderly anxious to know the transmutation and ultimate fate of our old friends *lit* and *light*, *spit* and *spite*, *wit* and *wight*, *sit* and *sight*, *bight* and *bt*, *fight* and *fit*, and many others equally dear. Do they obtain, as they seem to require, separate legislation for each of their peculiar necessities? Or, if not, what law can equally apply to cases so widely differing? Who is the presiding Master in Chancery for the nonce,—the blind disciple, or his quick-sighted stenographic teacher? No may certainly stand for *know*, and *cir* for *heir*; but what shall we say of *Rule 2*.:—*When the sound of a word is decidedly different from the spelling, the spelling is altered, as shurly for surely, sed for said, laf for laugh, braet for brought*? Allowing a Lucasian to *laf* instead of laugh, it seems a strange and unwise plan to teach a child an incorrect way of spelling some thousands (at least) of words in the English language, simply because he is afflicted with blindness. It is, in fact, saying to him,—now, if by perseverance you ever master stenography and survive Lucas, you shall also, if you attempt caligraphy, learn to write in a barbarous dialect which your friends who can see can neither understand nor decipher.

Of course, if surely becomes *shurly*, and surety *shurty*, sugar ought to be metamorphosed into *shugar*. Final *ees* are ignominiously cut off, as *giv*, *gan*, *fac*. Some words are expressed by a single character. Thus *q* stands for queen and question, *y* for yet and yesterday, *m* for me, or my mother, *v* for verily and vanity, *P. H.* for six or Pharisee or sixth, and so on *ad infinitum*, until one expects to find at the end of the list, *L* for Lucas, *lamentable*, and *labyrinth*. Let us construct a short sentence in

Lucasian dialect*, with its 'various readings' in full, for the exorcitation of a blind scholar.

<i>Lucasian Symbols,</i>	H.	ma.	y.	sav.	m	w.	p.
Various Interpretations or Readings.	} 1. He.	may	yet	save	me	with (we)	patience(up).
		2. Have	— yesterday	—	mother	world	upon.
		3. Hither	— ye	—	amongst	word(will)	put.

No horn-book ever yet devised contained such horrors as these, and the bitterness of Mavor, though greater than that of aloes, never, we fancy, appeared so terrible as a dose of Lucas would have done if it had dawned on our juvenile eyes in Lesson 6. of words of three syllables. Four other Tables of Rules and Directions follow the above, as an Introduction to an alphabet of a purely arbitrary character, and even to a person of sharp eyesight as hopelessly undecipherable as a wedge inscription from the banks of the Tigris. For some centuries past most civilised nations have been content to use the old Roman letter, with slight, if any, modifications. The difficulties of that system have been considered sufficient for the distraction of young Europe in general. It remained for the advocates of stenography for the blind to contrive for their especial behoof a system more complicated, elaborate, and full of difficulty than mortals of ordinary vision can understand or decipher without much juvenile suffering.

But in spite of these difficulties, many blind persons have learned to read by this system: a fact not so difficult to understand when it is noted that the society who print these books at their own cost, have also expended much time and labour in teaching pupils to read them. With time, talent, and perseverance, an earnest teacher may instruct a willing scholar on any given system, however elaborate or however faulty. Whether with a far less expenditure of time and labour the same pupils would not have learned to read by a common alphabetical system, is a totally different question. It is sufficient here to say that the

* The first verse of St. John's Gospel translated from *Lucas* into ordinary letters stands thus, and is sufficiently puzzling to a reader with eyes:—

in. t. bgini. ws. t. wrd. a. t. w. ws. w. g. a. t. w ws. g.

In reading, the blind scholar applies his touch most keenly to the *tops* of the letters, —and this part of the raised surface is generally found to be depressed or rubbed away sooner than any other, affording another argument against stenographic systems. For, although when the upper part of a *Roman letter*, as P, M, or A, be rubbed away, it may still be deciphered, a short-hand symbol in a like state of dilapidation is a hopeless puzzle.

Lucasian disciples had a chance of learning to read, if with difficulty, at a slight cost, and were glad to avail themselves of the chance, be it what it might. They have learned to read, therefore, by a very abbreviated and ambiguous kind of writing, sufficient perhaps for the *seeing*, who when learning short-hand have been previously instructed in reading, and yet very ill adapted to be the first and only reading taught to the blind.

‘In a new stenographic alphabet for the blind Mr. Lucas had an opportunity of framing a perfect one, containing a simple character for each of the elementary sounds of the English language; but instead of this he formed one deficient in no less than ten and redundant in eight characters.’ (*Letter to Lord Lansdowne*, p. 6.)

To the blind the abbreviation of words, so as to bring them at once within the compass of the touch, is doubtless an object of the first importance; and this abbreviation is professedly the main principle of Lucas’s system. But this very principle has been but partially applied. To the true elementary sounds *ch*, *sh*, and *th*, Lucas has appropriated a single stenographic character, but he has left the other ten, viz. the five long vowels, and five diphthongs, to be distinguished in his system, as in our orthography,—if distinguished at all,—by the addition of a second unsounded character. He seems to prefer, in practice, brevity to perspicuity; and rather than add the unsounded letter necessary to distinguish the long vowel from the short one, he makes no distinction between them; and thus ‘light,’ ‘rays,’ and ‘east’ are metamorphosed into ‘lit,’ ‘ras,’ and ‘est.’ He has uselessly copied in his embossing the anomalies of our own common orthography; but only makes his system more complicated to the blind reader by using four different stenographic characters for the sound of (*f*) as *ff*, *ph*, *gh*; two for (*s*) and two for (*l*), while he violates all consistency by amazing his disciples with such orthography as ‘*wid bems of lit in the skis*’ for ‘*wide beams of light in the skies*.’ Well, therefore, may Mr. Frere remark, ‘such a system as this is neither orthographical nor phonetic; it accords neither with spelling nor speech, and when made intelligible by being rendered into common characters, equally offends both the eye and ear.’ (*Letter*, p. 9.)

Of Mr. Frere’s own system, which is also a stenographic and arbitrary one, we are glad to speak very much more favourably. Whatever faults it may have, its ruling principle is fully and impartially applied; and mere consistency is a decided advantage. It is based on the phonetic principle, or combination of elementary sounds; which sounds, says the author, ‘consist of the pure vowel sounds and the pure sounds of the consonant; which

'latter are expressed in the final sounds of the words,' according to the order of the short-hand alphabet. Instead of our old placid and sufficiently abstruse A B C we must now call to mind that more modern friend (though long since dead and buried) '*the fonetic Nuz*;' and be introduced to sounds hissing, and sounds guttural, gushings, breathings, and aspirations, which are represented by thirty-six characters. 'This system,' says its author, 'may be denominated a scientific representation of speech, the alphabet containing one character, and but one, for each of the simple sounds of the English language, whose only names are the sounds they represent; and each word being embodied according to its actual pronunciation, the names of the characters combined, or sounded together, give the word; and the pupil is thus *nearly enabled to read as soon as he has learnt his alphabet.*'

Thus writes Mr. Frere himself; and his words are well worthy of attention. After a long life of devotion to the blind, he is entitled to speak and to be heard. He has devoted, and still continues to devote his time, his talents, and his substance to their welfare, and has won from many a poor blind creature heart-felt gratitude and respect. But his system, like all other systems, has its faults,—of which his earnest and unwearied advocates do not seem aware. One fallacy contained in Mr. Frere's words above quoted we have italicised; '*the pupil is nearly enabled to read as soon as he knows his alphabet.*'

There is no royal road to learning to read,—for pupils with or without eyes,—by virtue of any system whatever. From the days of the first horn-book to this very hour of '*reading made easy*,' '*spelling made play*,' when knowledge is offered to mankind without the trouble of learning, and sixpenny catechisms teach all things from Platonism to Pyrotechny,—there never has been a royal road. There never will be one. '*Reading made easy*' is a rough, winding, difficult road, at the best. He that travels by it,—whoever be his guide,—must make up his mind to many difficulties, and the payment of many 'pikes,' before he reach his journey's end. We appeal confidently to our readers, whose name is Legion,—and 'may their shadow never be less,'—if it be not so. Is there one among them all who mastered the easy art of reading without some juvenile suffering, some weeping, and many a hopeless sigh; even long after the mysteries and woes of the alphabet were triumphantly passed? Who would not be a reader on Frere's system if his journey through the alphabet was to land him safely among words of three syllables? We fear that the sentence should stand thus, '*the pupil will in due time learn to read as soon as he has learned*

'his alphabet.' One of Frere's most earnest, able, and unwearied advocates, who daily devotes time and talent, as well as an entire heart, to the instruction of the poor blind, thus speaks of his system:— 'It omits all superfluous letters of our common spelling, and calls the consonants by the sounds they actually give instead of by their names; so that the pupil having learned the sign for each sound in the language has only to pronounce them, and he of necessity reads.' This last remark is but a repetition of Mr. Frere's own words; and contains the same fallacy.

The same writer thus continues:— 'As compared to Alston's we should consider it only as an adjunct, but a necessary one; for such pupils as we teach would be totally incapable either of feeling the letters, or of overcoming the difficulties of ordinary reading and spelling. It is the system for the ignorant and the incapable.' To this the advocates of Alston (*the Roman letter*) strongly reply that the case is not proved; but that the contrary view is in their opinion the true one,— viz., that Alston's system is quite as easily taught as Frere's; that it possesses the inestimable advantage of being understood and read by any one who can read ordinary print,—and thus is one strong check against the further isolation of the blind;—and moreover that 'the great majority of blind persons now in England who can read do so on an alphabetical system.*' This last fact, we must confess, argues strongly in favour of Alston. If Frere's system had been the easier and more expeditious of the two, surely the blind themselves are the very people to have discovered and profited by it long ago. Our own experience, formed chiefly from the testimony of the blind, leads us to believe that Alston's is as easily acquired as any other system, and when once acquired is the best. 'As an adjunct' to Alston's, Frere's is a most useful system, but clearly not as a substitute for it. The laborious '*memoria technica*' is far too long and too complicated; standing greatly in need of all the author can say in its defence at p. 14. of his letter. He appears himself to feel the

* Vide circular of the Society for printing Books for the Use of the poor Blind, 24. Arundel Street, Strand.

Mr. Taylor, the skilful printer of Queen's Street, Lincoln's Inn, has, under the direction of the Rev. W. Taylor (formerly Superintendent of the Blind School at York), printed in embossed type for the blind, a life of James Watt. The type used is *lower case* and *Roman capitals*, and to the few blind who can distinguish such small letters will no doubt be a great boon. It is only to be regretted that the divided energies and means of the different printing societies are not united for one great and vigorous effort.

weakness of this part of his cause when he admits of its employment *being optional*, though he instantly adds that any system would be incomplete without such a provision. If any such provision be at all necessary, we think it would be of far more service in a very abridged form.

Mr. Frere's alphabet consists of *twenty-nine* signs, each of a purely arbitrary description, and having tagged on to it by way of description, some such 'morceau' for the memory of a child, — or an ignorant and older learner, — as the following: — '∠ δ *An angle, the points forwards, the straight line downwards, the same as a half circle the points forwards, the dot downwards*' is *chch* — [CHLH] is CHanged from a crescent by a dot on its 'lower limb — *atch, etch, itch, otch, utch.*' This versicle is to teach the blind scholar the sound of (*ch*), and must be repeated every time [CHEH] meets his fingers' ends; and this we are told is an easier process for the blind scholar, when multiplied by twenty-nine, than making acquaintance with our old sober friends, A, B, C, or H, &c., in the same guise as that known to the rest of mankind. To make the whole matter clearer to the learner, Mr. Frere, having divided the vowels into five long and five short, abolishes their representation in embossed printing, except by simple dots, which in different positions denote different vowels. That our readers may understand this rather obscure arrangement, we will take an example from page 5. of the *Grammar*: — '*Wherefore when the wise warn do not fools edify?*' being translated into Frere, becomes '*. . . r-fr . . n th . . z- . . awn d. . flz. . nt 'd . . f —.*' We leave the further consideration of this dialect to our readers' own judgment and good sense, only adding that the twenty-nine versicles, with their respective *Angles* . >, are followed by '*XII Rules in verse for supplying the omitted vowels,*' of which we feel bound to give one single specimen — the longest: —

RULE V.

'The final upper dot is *a* or *e*
The middle *i*, the lower *o* or *u*;
If you the vowel rightly would supply,
This is the thing you'll do:
When at the end no dot at all you see,
You'll understand and use the vowel *e*.
When letters two or more before the dot are seen,
You'll find the vowel out, and bring it in between.'

The other XI all partake more or less of the same character, chiefly relating to the mystical dots which symbolise vowel sounds. We do not imagine that the blind have any peculiar liking for rhymes of this kind, and certain we are that ordinary

learners of alphabets would be apt to regard them as so many drags on the wheel of progress. It is not a fair argument to say, as Mr. Frere in his letter does, that he has derived great help himself from the use of a similar *memoria technica*. That which is of great service to a well-read scholar like Mr. Frere may be a drag and a burden to a dull, ignorant, young or stupid blind scholar. '*A hint on the spot*,' says Gray, '*is worth a cart-load of recollections*.' The remark is trite but true. Suppose, therefore, instead of giving the pupil twelve rhyming rules, touching lower, middle, and upper dots, we simply present to his reading-finger a hint on the spot—the old Roman A. Let him feel it over in every part, and, if he pleases, associate with it the thought of a triangle, a pyramid, or any other figure of a like kind. To use his own phrase, let him '*look at it carefully*,' as Master Johnny or Charles in a Belgravian nursery is taught to do at great A; and when once he has fully realised its shape and dimensions the chances are ten to one that he remembers the mw without needing any aid from a '*cart-load*' of rhymes. Rule XII. and last is, —

'Whene'er the proper rule don't yield you satisfaction,
On trial you will find the word is a contraction.'

Of the other objections which have been with difficulty alleged against this system, we will only remark that they appear to us trivial and unfair. It is true that Mr. Frere, in rather a despotic way, banishes the sound of (*r*) in such words as horse and force; omits the vowels in all monosyllables, so that (*nt*) stands for net, not, or nut; (*st*) for sot, sit, sat, or set, &c.; that he orders all such terminations as *ing*, *men**t*, *tiol**n*, to appear only in their final consonant; that long words, such as Jerusalem, nevertheless, are severely clipped, reappearing in some such shape as *J—rsm*, *nv : rths*; but such minor defects as these are not incompatible with much excellence.

We do not attach much value to the lists of *cases* which we have heard cited with great earnestness on behalf of the various systems by their respective disciples. Such lists of names irresistibly remind us of other advertisements, wherein we read of certain, speedy, perfect, infallible, easy, pleasant, surprising, delightful cures of every ailment, affliction, and calamity under the sun. We have but to take the '*Thirty Golden Drops*,' —

'When straightway through our feeble worn-out frame
Rude blooming health at once resumes her sway.'

The cures appear so magically perfect, that one almost longs to enjoy the luxury of so complete and sovereign a remedy.

Without doubt many blind persons have mastered Frere's

system, and of those a large proportion are excellent readers; but the circumstances of the case are such that any other result would have long since consigned '*The Phonetic System*' to that abode of oblivion wherein our deceased friend the '*Phonetic Naz*' now lies sepulchred and forgotten. The fact is that nine-tenths of Frere's readers have been taught either by himself or under his own immediate superintendence. Mr. Frere, and the friends who work with him and for him, possess talents, abundance of leisure, and the golden sinews of all success—money. These they devote nobly, heartily, unweariably to the cause. Their very hearts and souls are in the work. What wonder that local success has crowned their labour o' love? What system—having good for its object—would not thrive under such noble auspices, such unwearied diligence, such ardent zeal?

'With such right arms as these in such a cause,
Who doubts of victory?'

We believe that Mr. Frere would think nothing of travelling fifty miles to teach a poor blind man to read his Bible, and we cannot doubt of success attending such a work. But the defects of a system are not a whit the less flagrant, however noble may be its author's charity, or earnest his labours.

In our younger days we were much afflicted with a treacherous memory; like the invalid's of another date, our motto might well have been '*plenus vimarum.*' In our distress we were recommended a dose of '*Gray's Memoria Technica.*' In this system letters stand for numerals, which numerals are appended to certain other *half words*, themselves being signs or symbols of certain *events* or *names* to be remembered. Barbarous enough was the jargon, but a few doses were said to be infallible. The first instalment we exhibit in its native crude form, as we first tasted it:—'*Croftth Deletok Abanub Exafna Tembybc Cynutz.*' Such was the primary and delicious morsel to be administered to the unfortunately weak and treacherous memory, after 'getting up' with considerable difficulty the detail, rules, and principles of the system itself. Surely of all barbarous hexameters this was the most uncouthly barbarous. *Croftth* signified that the Creation took place B. C. 4004, *Deletok* the Deluge 2348, and so on to Cyrus himself metamorphosed into *Cynutz*. All history, ancient and modern, was thus translated into barbarous hexameters, and a royal road at once opened to an intimate acquaintance with every date, large or small, since the days of Adam. It was merely to learn a few score (or hundreds, as the case might be,) of such pleasant hexameters, and '*the disciple*' would be no more troubled with weakness of memory, &c. for

VOL. XCIX. NO. CCI.

G

'*the rest of his life.*' In reply to this we have only to say, that the same amount of diligence, time, and labour expended on Old Testament history on a more ordinary, intelligible, and simple plan, would have infallibly taught the disciple all he wished to acquire in the matters of Adam, Noah, and Cyrus. The same argument applies to all systems encumbered with such a *memoria technica*. The same amount of time, labour, diligence, and hearty love expended in teaching an Alphabetical System would have produced not only equal but far greater results. There would have been a wider field for work, many more advocates, and consequently greater resources; and, above all, a more abundant harvest. There would have been no necessity for the teacher to get up the system beforehand; any one who could read, who had an hour to spare, and a heart to devote it to the blind, might at once have set to work. Unity of action would have been secured, and the success which attends unity of action would have followed.

But all these contingencies are now but profitless *would-have-beens*; and meanwhile Mr. Moon of Brighton is waiting. He has invented a system of reading which he naturally enough considers perfect. His advocates are few in number, but so strongly convinced of the superiority of their own views and the inferiority of every one else's, that to them he would appear to be

'Velut inter ignes
Luna minores.'

Let us hear what Mr. Moon says for himself:—'In order to avoid the complicated form of the Roman letter, and the still less discernible angular type,' he tells us 'that he has invented an alphabet, each letter of which is formed of two lines only; most of the letters bearing a *partial resemblance* to those in common use. Nine forms placed in different positions represent the whole alphabet and numerals, one form serving for A, V, K, L, and X, and another for E, I, M, and Y, while there are but four contracted forms, *ment*, *ing*, *tion*, and *ness*.'

Merely pausing to notice that the use of *nt* for *ment*, *tn* for *tion*, &c., is not a very profound or original idea, let us now see how far the claims of the advocates of this system are to be allowed. It is asserted, that the system is not an arbitrary but an alphabetical one; that so great a resemblance exists between the *Roman* and *Moonish* characters, that a teacher with eyes would readily, if not at once, read by Moon's system; and that, nevertheless, so simple are the Moonish characters, and so entirely are the '*intricacies of the Roman letters*' removed, that a blind scholar learns to read by them with greater facility than

by the ordinary A, B, C.* We will leave both these questions to be decided by our readers on glancing at the following practical proofs:—

1. *Proof of resemblance between Moonish and Roman Letters.*

Roman	P.	Q.	R.	S.	T.
Moonish	⌒	⌒	⌒	⌒	—

2. *Proof of Intricacies being removed.*

Roman	H.	I.	J.	K.	L.
Moonish	⊙.	.	⌒.	<.	⌒.

For our own part we must confess that we can neither discern the faintest trace of the resemblance sought to be established by No. 1., nor detect the removal of more than the least possible intricacy by No. 2. In fact, the system claims both the freedom of an arbitrary character, as well as the advantages of an alphabetical one; it professes to be at once like and unlike the same thing; and of necessity failing to establish any claim to either title, ends in being a mere mongrel. Of all the systems, moreover, this is among the bulkiest and most expensive, two characteristics which are alone sufficient to prevent its ever being adopted by any but its own few partisans.

If the New Testament, printed in all the five systems used in the English language, be taken as a standard of comparison, the following table will show the relative position of each.

Systems	Number of Vols	Size	Number of Pages	Lines in Page	Square Inches in Page	Price
American - -	2	4to	130	—	117	£ s d 0 16 0
Alston's - -	4	"	623	42	90	2 0 0
Incas' - -	9	"	541	27	70	2 0 0
Ficke's - -	8	Ob 4to	723	—	110	2 10 0
Moon's - -	9	"	—	25	110	4 10 0

Mr. Moon, himself a blind man, deserves the highest praise for his labours in behalf of his fellow sufferers; but he might have done them a better service if he had led them into the highway*,—the old beaten highway, where fellow travellers who had eyes might have helped them on the journey, instead of

* It is true that the highway is often not the shortest road,—that with many a winding turn it presses steadily on up hill and down dale; but even highways which wind among mountains, by being much frequented, become gradually so smooth and commodious, that it is much better to follow them than to seek a *straighter* path by climbing over the tops of rocks and descending to the bottom.' (*Descartes, on Method*, p. 57.)

taking them by a short cut across the fields. Stiles, brambles, and miry paths add neither to the pleasure, despatch, or profit of any journey; whether it be to escape uphill toil over the old *Roman road*, or the stones of a more recent piece of Mac Adam. Thus far, the different systems of embossed printing. Before, however, we quit this part of our subject we must again touch on the all-important point of price. Books of embossed printing, on whatever system, are chiefly for the benefit of the *poor* blind; their cost, therefore, is a question of primary importance. And in this age of cheap books, when a handsome library can be purchased for a few pounds, it is sad to think that the poor blind man who may chance to have mastered *the great task* of reading, cannot procure even the New Testament on any system at a less cost than 2*l.*; even on Frere's it will cost 2*l.* 10*s.*; and if he have grown up under the maine shadow of Mr. Moon, he will be mulcted of 4*l.* 10*s.* To all intents and purposes, therefore, the New Testament as a whole is utterly beyond the reach of those who most need it; the poorest and most ignorant of the blind. But it remains to be proved whether the printers of this age will not be able to introduce into printing for the blind improvements equal to those which mark every other branch of the art. To use a well-known phrase of logical precision, 'there is no antecedent improbability' why the blind should not have a pocket bible and prayer book, and therewith rejoice on many a happy Sunday. Neither is there any '*archidiaconal*' reason why they should not in a shilling volume wax melancholy over the sable miseries of Uncle Tom, or enjoy with wonder and delight the exciting adventures of that worthy mariner Robinson Crusoe.

We now come to another branch of our subject, and to note what has been done for the intellectual cultivation of the blind. Little more has been yet accomplished in England than teaching them to read*, write, and cipher, and even thus far only in the best of the schools with any degree of accuracy or skill. But the spirit of inquiry on their behalf is now spreading through the land. Many thoughtful and philanthropic men are expending

* But looking back on what Saunderson and Moyes achieved in the study of pure science and mathematics, there seems to be no reason why a few of the cleverest pupils who show any taste for such subjects should not be allowed to read a book or two of Euclid. That the attempt has been made, and not without success, we know. It is more than probable that the blind boy who fairly crosses the fatal '*Pons asinorum*,' realises the *pure reason* of his task far more fully than many a learner with eyes who again and again describes the dreadful angle on a greasy slate.

time and labour on a subject at once of interest and importance, and the next ten years will probably witness many useful discoveries in aid of so intelligent and afflicted a class.

As might naturally be supposed, the study of Music affords to the blind the purest and most unmixed pleasure; for in this pursuit are they least reminded of their infirmity. They find in it scope for the highest imagination, as well as the deepest feelings of religion; and when a blind man becomes a musician he is one with his whole *heart*, giving up to this study his entire energies and thoughts. At the Blind School in St. George's Fields, under the able direction of Mr. Turle of Westminster Abbey, many of the pupils have attained considerable skill both in vocal and instrumental music. A blind choir, guided and accompanied by a blind organist, performing choruses and solos from the works of Handel, Mozart, Mendelssohn, Bach, and other choice masters, is, indeed, a surprising spectacle; of which, however, our readers may themselves judge by attending one of their usual Monthly Concerts at the School. It is much to be regretted that difficulty should exist in procuring situations for blind organists, however well qualified, more especially as the pupil who becomes a musician rarely masters a trade, or shows much skill as a reader.

How the blind man writes is a problem of much easier solution than that of on what system he is to learn to read. The apparatus he uses is very simple. A small framework of wood, somewhat like a gridiron without a handle, is made to shut with a hinge on a flat square of mahogany, on which is laid the sheet of paper. Between the wooden bars thus resting on the paper, the writer inserts, one by one, each letter,—a small slip of deal with the Roman capital (thus :) protruding from one end in points of metal. These points pierce the paper and produce corresponding letters: the operation being most like what children call 'pricking a pattern;' easily seen by the eye, and on the reverse side easily detected by the finger. The process is soon learned, and requires but a little patience, strength of finger, and a knowledge of spelling not Moonish or Lucasian.* Almost as easily the blind scholar learns to use a ciphering frame, which is of the ordinary size,—of metal in a frame of wood. Across it, in parallel lines at equal distances, run rows of pentagonal holes, like the cells of a honey-comb.

* Mr. Hughes, the Governor of the Blind School at Manchester, has invented a most ingenious typograph for the use of the blind. But its price at once removes it beyond the reach of all but the wealthy.

Into these holes he inserts his figure (2 or 8, or whatever it be), which consists of a small metal pentagonal plug terminating at one end in two forked points, at the other in a single obtuse point. When this plug is inserted into the hole, one end remains above the surface of the slate, and according to its position and the nature of the point, whether twofold or single, the finger of the blind scholar determines what figure is represented; the different positions being obviously ten in number. With an apparatus of this kind the scholar of an ordinary blind school manages to work simple sums in the four chief rules of arithmetic; but beyond a knowledge of these four comparatively few ever pass. It may be asked, 'Why cannot the blind in some degree emulate the skill and dexterity of Saunderson the famous blind mathematician? How, if they as a class never progress beyond the horrors of long division, could he, without ingenious frames and pentagonal plugs, calculate the doctrine of eclipses and comets, and explain those profound laws which guide the stars in their courses?'

Genius like Saunderson's ever devises ways and means of its own. It has a thousand little contrivances unknown to the ordinary student, who is content enough to travel along the beaten road which others have fashioned for him. Saunderson's whole machinery for computing was a small sheet of deal, divided by lines into a certain number of squares, and pierced at certain angles with holes large enough to admit a metal pin. With this simple board and a box of pins he made all his calculations; yet, in 1711, he was the friend of Sir Isaac Newton, and by his interest was elected Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge. It is most probable that he never beheld the distant orbs of heaven, yet with the highest skill he reasoned of the laws which control them; unfolding and explaining the nature and beauty of light which he could not behold, and the glory of that bow in the clouds which he had never seen.*

Thus, also, was it with Huber, the blind philosopher of Geneva. His discoveries in the honied labours of bees have equalled, if not surpassed, those of any other one student of Nature. It remained for Huber, not only to corroborate truths which others had partially discovered, but also to detect and

* Of the keenness with which he entered on these studies, and the readiness with which he received outward impressions, M. Dufau gives a striking proof:—'Assistant un jour à des observations astronomiques qui se faisaient en plein air, s'apercevait des momens où le soleil était obscurci par des nuages passagers, au point de pouvoir indiquer lui-même avec précision l'instant où il fallait suspendre ou poursuivre les observations.'

describe minute particulars which had escaped even the acute observation of Swammerdam. It is true that others supplied him with eyes, but he furnished them with thought and intellect; *he saw with their eyes*. Thus he clearly proved that there are two distinct sets of bees in every hive, honey gatherers and the wax makers and nurses; that the larvæ of working bees can by course of diet be changed to queens; thus also he accurately described the sanguinary conflicts of rival queens; the recognition of old companions or of royalty by the use of the antennæ; thus he explained the busy hum and unceasing vibration of wing ever going on in the hive, as being necessary for due ventilation.*

One of the last incidents in the old man's life that seemed to rouse and interest him, was the arrival of a present of *stingless* bees, from their discoverer, Captain B. Hall. Unwearied diligence, and love for his work no doubt greatly aided him in all these discoveries; but genius effected for him what mere assiduity would never have accomplished. She taught him in a few minutes to swim the river of difficulty, while others spent hours in searching for a ford. It is the union of diligence and genius which has made so many a blind man famous among his brethren with eyes; not only the way to conceive but the hand to carry out and achieve, in its own way, the plan of wisdom and of beauty. Thus, Metcalf, the blind guide and engineer, constructed roads through the wilds of Derbyshire; thus, Davidson ventilated the deepest coal mines, and lectured on the structure of the eye; as did Dr. Moyes† on chemistry and optics; thus, Blacklock, poet and musician, master of four languages besides his own, wrote both prose and poetry with elegance and ease‡; thus

* A diseased state of an organ of sense will perpetually tamper with the understanding, and perhaps at last overthrow it. But when one organ is obliterated, the mind applies some other to a double use. Some ten years back, at Sowerby, I met a man perfectly blind, — from infancy. His chief amusement was *fishing on the wild uneven banks of the Eden*, and up the difficult mountain streams. His friend, a dexterous card-player, also stone-blind, knew every gate and stile of the district. John Gough, of Kendal, *blind*, is not only a mathematician, but an infallible botanist and zoologist; *correcting mistakes of keen sportsmen as to birds and vermin*. His face is all one eye. (*Condensed from Coleridge's Omniana*, p. 332.)

† The eyes of Moyes, although he was totally blind, were not insensible to intense light. Colours were not distinguished by him, but felt. *Red* was disagreeable; he said it was like *'the grating of a saw'*; while *green* was very pleasant, and compared to *'a smooth surface'* when touched.

‡ In some instances blindness seems to have gifted the sufferer with new powers.

A Dr. Guyse, we read, lost his eyesight in the pulpit while he

nearer to our own time, Holman the traveller, to whose labours we have already referred, has made himself a name far beyond the shores of Great Britain. We know not what Saundersons or Hubers the present generation is to see. One name equally great in another path of fame it already has; Prescott, the historian of Ferdinand and Isabella, Mexico and Peru, &c., who, though not blind, has a defect of the eyes which prevents him from reading and writing, but whose literary labours have nevertheless delighted and instructed thousands both in the Old and New World. We are glad also to observe, that Lord Cranborne has come before the world as an author; having written an excellent little 'History of France' for children. We trust that this is but an earnest of what he intends to do for learners of a larger growth.

In the meanwhile it is pleasant to reflect that much more is now being attempted for the blind than has ever yet been accomplished. Asylums and schools are being established in many parts of England: in all which we hope that the tone and extent of education are to rise far above what has yet been done. It argues well for the ground of this hope that a well-organised society is at length in existence, the object of which is to provide a series of standard works for the blind at the smallest possible cost. Schools and asylums may be multiplied throughout the length and breadth of the land to any extent, but if the blind when they leave the school are to go back to the workhouse, the labourer's cottage, the crowded attic of the artisan, or even a workshop of their own, — *without books*, and without the means of procuring them, — their having learned to dare will, after all its cost of toil and time, be but a cause of discontent and repining. We trust, therefore, that all success may attend the labours of *The Society for Printing and Distributing Books for the Use of the Blind*, especially if they print *cheap bibles*.

As it is probable that many of our readers have never visited a school for the blind, we will pay a short visit to the great one in St. George's Fields, probably the largest in the

was at prayer before the sermon; but nevertheless managed to preach as usual. An old lady of the congregation hearing him deplore his loss, thus strove to comfort him: — 'God be praised,' said she, 'that your sight is gone. I never heard your Reverence preach so powerful a service in my life. *I wish for my own part that the Lord had taken away your sight twenty years ago; for your ministry would have been more useful by twenty degrees.*' The old lady's judicial wish was rather a severe one; but of the correctness of her conclusion we are inclined to doubt.

world. Of the building we will only say that it is large and imposing in appearance. It contains about 150 pupils, both males and females, of very various ages, almost entirely from the indigent class. The object of the school is to teach the blind to read the Bible, and to impart to them such a knowledge of some useful trade as shall enable them if only in part to earn their own living. For this purpose they are usually retained in the school for a period of about six and a half years. All the pupils are totally blind, and yet the majority not only learn to read well, but to write, to cipher, and to spell, besides mastering a trade, or learning to play the organ. We will enter one of the chief work rooms. In it, hard at work, we find upwards of forty boys and men, all totally blind, making basket work of every possible size and description, from the finest and most delicate of dinner mats to the gigantic ark of unpeeled osier for packing swans for a journey across the North Sea. The workers are all cheerful, nay in most cases, merry. Baskets, flower-stands, chairs, and screens, in short, all kinds of wicker work, are here made by the thousand every year. The little boy on the left is a new comer. He is taking a first lesson from the foreman, and learning to split the osiers. In a month from this time he will be able to make a rough market basket. Two months ago he sat moping in a dark corner of a fisherman's cottage in Cornwall, in forlorn helplessness. Since then mind and body have begun to revive, — he is now bright, cheerful, and intelligent, — he can now use his limbs, and begins to find out that he has a mind — aye, and much more — a soul, within him : he has mastered his alphabet, has begun the good habit of saying daily prayers with his companions, and hearing God's word read. His education has commenced, he is learning to think, he is waking up to a new life.*

Look where we will, the work goes busily and deftly on,

* The female pupils in this School undergo, we find, a somewhat similar education and training to the boys. A few learn basket-making, &c. ; but by far the greater number devote their time to various kinds of sewing, knitting, and netting, spinning twine, making window and picture-frame cord (used at the Royal Castle of Windsor for Her Majesty's pictures), purse-making, and hair-weaving of every possible description. All the household linen in use throughout the School is also made up by the girls and women.

We cannot mention this Institution without connecting with it the name of S. H. Sterry, Esq., of Bermondsey, who throughout a long and well-spent life has laboured most zealously and successfully for the Blind. His labours on their behalf date from the foundation of the school at the beginning of the present century.

as if all the workers had the best of eyes. They sort the osiers, peel them, split them, arrange them for use, if necessary point them, and chip off stray ends of obnoxious twigs with a sharp knife. Enter the shoe shop, and we are impressed with the same conviction, and judging only by the work done we decide at once that the workmen *must* have sharp eyes; hammering, cutting, sewing, going on as cleverly and quickly as among the most clear-sighted set of Crispins. In this room are made shoes for the whole 150 pupils. Enter the mat shop, look at that mountain of mats of all colours, asperities, and sizes; all made by more busy workers whose eyes never saw what their hands so diligently toiled at. The old man near us is busy at an enormous door mat too vast, thick, and solid, it would seem, for any but the sons of Anak. It is for the hall of the Guards' Club in Pall Mall. The boy next to him is fringing his mat with bright green; it is a small neat and dainty affair to be placed inside the study door of dyspeptic Mr. Brown as he reads metaphysics. He is dreadfully afraid of draughts, and this diminutive mat has squared edges, that it may fit exactly into the required space inside his door which leads into the garden. The door opens inwards, but so thin is the mat, that the panel sweeps smoothly over it with ease. Mat-making appears to be hard work, requiring great exertion in beating and combing as the work proceeds, the workman standing during the whole day.

That huge pile on the right is chiefly of coloured rugs, decked with brilliant borders, wreaths of flowers, and patterns of all hues and sizes. It seems impossible that they are the work of the blind. But they can be, and are made in this very shop. The man working at a loom in the corner is making a rug, with a brilliant crimson scroll at either corner on a dark ground. His wools of different colours are given to him by the foreman *in a certain order*; and these he himself arranges by his side, easily within reach, also in a certain order. But how shall he *know* the pattern of the future rug? No possible description, even if the busy foreman could afford time for it, could explain the intricacies of that scroll work. It must be exactly done, too, for it is to match a carpet; every twisted leaf of that rare flower and that curious branch, which grow only in carpet-land, must be accurately copied, or Mr. Brown's critical eye will be offended as he stands in a judicial mood on the border where the land of drugget commences. How then is our rug-maker to follow a pattern he has never seen, in colours of which he has not the faintest notion? Look at him, he is consulting his guide. It is a thin smooth sheet of deal, mathematically divided

by cross-bar lines, scratched into the surface. At certain points of intersection nails are inserted, some deeply, some lightly, others almost buried in the wood, barely catching the eye. The blind weaver is reading them with his finger. They describe to him the pattern his eye never saw, which is now being reproduced for Mr. Cassio Brown. Observe that some nails have large dropsical heads,—others are headless,—a third kind are dying of atrophy,—mere pins; a fourth class wear college caps; and a fifth are but ignominious brads. As his finger follows the line of brads, it is to him as a waved line, circle, or square, it may be of green, or black, or what not, but which ever it be, he feels at once the exact point where the collegians meet their enemies the vulgar brads, and knows, therefore, where to insert the necessary change of colour. Each nail tells its own story, every change of colour, and every new line of march, and this story the blind weaver reads with his fingers' ends.*

Of course it is not every pupil that attains this degree of skill and dexterity. Some never attain it. It is the reward of many years' patient assiduity on the part of teacher and pupil. It is not to be wondered at that comparatively few attain to so great an amount of skill, but that a single blind pupil ever thus masters a weaver's difficult trade. We might easily fill many pages with a further account of the works and ways of blind scholars, and perhaps run the risk of exhausting our readers' patience. Many more famous names† still remain unnoticed,

* The detection of colour by the touch of the blind is a mooted point. M. Guillié mentions several anecdotes of blind persons who had the power of discriminating colours by the touch. But, if the testimony of a large body of English blind children can be relied on, the detection of colour is utterly beyond their reach. Saunderson's power of detecting by his *finger* or *tongue*, a counterfeit coin which had deceived the *eye* of a connoisseur, is a totally different question. We are hardly aware how much of our dexterity in the use of the eye arises from incessant practice. Those who have been relieved of blindness at an advanced or even an early period of life, have been often found to recur to the old and more familiar sense of touch, in preference to sight; especially during the first few months after recovering their sight. Coleridge (in his *Omniانا*) mentions a most remarkable instance of a blind man at Hanover, who possessed so keen a touch as to be able to read with his fingers books of *ordinary print*, if printed, as most German books are, on coarse paper. (P. 334.)

† One remarkable instance is given by Dufau at p. 89., with which we have never met before:—‘On cite en Angleterre un parent de l'auteur du Roman célèbre de *Tom Jones* (Fielding) qui tout aveugle qu'il était, exerçait à Londres les fonctions de *Chief Magistrate* of

though well deserving of note, and replete with interest. From the golden days of 'the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle,' down to our own unpoetic age, when the blind man's song is apt to be redolent of Lucifer matches, and to whine for pity expressed in copper coin, we might easily select many a noble instance of genius, 'cui profundum cæcitas lumen dedit.'

But we think that our present purpose has been fulfilled if we have succeeded in laying before our readers those features in the history and habits of the blind, as a class, wherein chiefly lies the difference between them and the rest of mankind. We have seen what has been done on their behalf, and may now form a fair judgment of what remains to be accomplished. However peculiar and isolated a race they may be, they still have, in common with other men, powers and faculties of mind and body which must be fully recognised and cherished, or every peculiarity will grow more marked, until the isolation has become final and complete.

If the books provided for their use are to be few in number, and those few all of one peculiar cast and tone of thought and subject; if, in short, they are to be dieted on some one dish of mental papulum of unbroken monotony, instead of sharing, at least to some extent, in the lessons of wisdom and beauty to be found elsewhere, it cannot be a matter of surprise that their education should progress but slowly, if it sink not into utter stagnation.

Beyond all doubt the blind man must as he learns to read be taught to prize the book of books above all others. To one in his circumstances it has a special voice and message of hope and comfort. But to institute a comparison between the one book and others, and then to decide that he shall read no single page of amusement or entertainment to the end of his days, appears to be at once an act of injustice and bigotry. The very comparison itself is wanting in that respect which is due to the sacred volume, and on which the decision professes to be founded; while its practical result is thus expressed to the sufferer, — 'You have lost the use of your eyes, and are thus in ' a measure cut off from your fellow men, and shut out from ' many sources of pleasure, amusement, and instruction, which ' they enjoy, care shall therefore be taken to cut you off ' entirely from all such sources of enjoyment in the world of ' books.'

' *the Police Office* ou de Lieutenant de Police; il avait dans la tête ' ses signalemens de plusieurs milliers de voleurs, et ne se trompait ' jamais lorsqu'on les traduisait devant lui.'

A far juster and wiser decision would, we think, be as follows: 'You have lost your sight, and are thus in a measure isolated from the rest of men; as far as possible, therefore, we will atone to you for the loss. Instead of shutting up, we will open, every available channel of information. Having first learned to read and to value the wisest and best of all books, you shall have placed within your reach lessons of wisdom, truth, and beauty, to be found in other pages.' It is a decision to which the friends of real education must, sooner or later, come.

In proportion as the blind share heartily and thankfully in all that is found to invigorate, to purify, and to instruct the human mind, in that exact ratio will they learn not only to value aright the written Word, but to own Him in whom they live and move. The mental vision will become bright and clear, as the physical blindness is made a lighter burden. The eyes of the soul alone see clearest traces of that great Being to whom the night is as the day. It is true that much has been done for the blind; but much still remains to be done on wider principles, and with more enlarged views. The whole spirit of the age demands that it should be so. Throughout every grade in the social scale is it beginning to be felt, that the life and well being of all is inseparably connected with the welfare of the individual; that the vitality of no one class can be real or lasting, but as it shares in the vitality of the whole. The natural result of this feeling is healthy reaction; new blood is beginning to mingle with the old, and every pulsation gives promise of fresh vigour and renewed life. We agree, indeed, with Prescott in thinking that 'what has already been done has conferred a service on the blind, which we, insensible from the very prodigality of our blessings, cannot fully estimate. The glimmering of the taper which is lost in the blaze of day may be sufficient to guide the steps of him whose path lies through darkness.' True, a lantern on a dark night is better than no light at all; it may save us from many a stumble, though it cannot save us from an occasional step into miry ways, or perchance from here and there taking a wrong turning. All we ask for the blind is such a share in the advantages, privileges, and enjoyments of the rest of the world as can fairly be given, and really used. Adopting Prescott's simile of the taper, we would say to every friend of the cause in words of an older date, —

'Tu, carusque Deis, et abundans lumine, soli

Ne tibi lumen habe; commune sit omnibus æque.'

ART. III.—1. *A Bill to make better Provision for the Management of Episcopal and Capitular Estates.* (Brought in by the Marquis of Blandford and Captain Kingscote.) London : 1853.

2. *A Bill to amend the Law respecting Simony.* (Brought in by Dr. R. Phillimore and Viscount Goderich.) London : 1853.

THERE probably never was a year in which so many ecclesiastical subjects were brought before the notice of Parliament as in that which has just ended. The Session began in February with the great fight of the Clergy Reserves. It ended in August with the usual 'massacre of the innocents,' wherein the Colonial Church Bill, the Missionary Bishops Bill, and the Episcopal Estates Bill were stifled in a single week. Between these epochs both Houses were repeatedly occupied upon subjects connected with the temporalities of the Church. The law of Patronage was canvassed in two debates on Dr. Phillimore's Simony Bill; Lord Blandford's important measure for the better management of Church Property was several times before the House of Commons: a proposed amendment in the law of Church Rates furnished matter for an interesting discussion, and was supported in an able pamphlet by Lord Stanley; the assessment of Episcopal Revenues was brought before the House of Lords by the Bishop of Salisbury; a Church Building Act was carried through the same House by Lord Harrowby; and a Cathedral Appointments Act was passed by the Government. These numerous measures are a proof that increasing interest is felt by the Legislature in a most important field of legislation. But the growth of knowledge has hardly kept pace with this growth of interest. Even those speakers and writers who aspire to guide public opinion occasionally show, by the extraordinary errors and misstatements into which they are betrayed, a surprising want of practical acquaintance with the most elementary facts relating to their subject. It is with the hope of contributing to the correction of such errors, that we devote the following pages to an examination of some questions in Ecclesiastical Economy which have lately been the theme of frequent argument, both in Parliament and in the Press; and, in connexion with these questions, to the consideration of certain schemes which have been suggested for effecting alterations in the Church Establishment.

In the first place, we may say a few words concerning the actual amount of the Ecclesiastical Revenues. It is strange that there is, as yet, no official document which enables us to state

this with perfect accuracy. With regard to the Parochial Tithes and Glebe, which form the bulk of the property in question, the foundation of our knowledge is the 'Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into Ecclesiastical Revenues,' presented to Parliament in 1835, which gives the value of all the benefices so far as could be then ascertained. The returns, however, on which this Report was founded, were in some respects incomplete; and many additional benefices have been created since it was published. The best information now accessible on this subject is contained in the annual 'Clergy List,' which gives an alphabetical catalogue of every living in England and Wales, with its annual value (founded mainly on the above-mentioned returns), its population, and the names of its officiating ministers. We have ascertained from this list that the estimated net annual value of the 12,270 benefices in England and Wales is 3,479,460*l*.* This sum is divided amongst 17,155 parochial ministers, including 4,885 curates.† The average income of the 12,270 incumbents is 283*l*. per annum.

A trifling addition is made to these funds by *surplice fees* and *Easter offerings*. The former amount to 5*l*. for a population of 1000, and consequently may be estimated at 90,000*l*. for the whole country, which at present contains a population of

* In the Clergy List for 1853, the number of benefices whose value is returned is 11,513; the number not returned is 757. The value of those returned is 3,264,260*l*.; and to this we have added a proportional sum for the 757 not returned, which will be 214,600*l*. This gives the total value mentioned in the text. It must be remarked however, that in thus estimating the benefices not returned, we have much exaggerated their value. For 579 out of the 757 are new districts, and proprietary chapels endowed chiefly with pew rents, and yielding an income much below the average. We thus leave a margin more than sufficient to cover any pew rents which may have been omitted in the returns of 1835. We must also observe that the value of all rectories and Vicarages has been reduced, since 1835, by the repeal of the Corn Laws. Thus a tithe-rent charge of the nominal value of 100*l*. (as fixed by the Commutation Act in 1836) only amounted to 91*l*. in 1853, and will be under 90*l*. when this is published in 1854. Hence the total above given is greater than the truth.

† We have ascertained the number of curates by adding together the number licensed in each diocese as given in Whitaker's Ecclesiastical Almanac for 1853. The total number of clergy in England and Wales, according to the Clergy List for 1853, is 18,350. Of these 17,155 would thus appear to be employed in parochial work; the remainder are either dignitaries, schoolmasters, chaplains, or retired from professional duties.

eighteen millions. The *Easter offerings* average 1*l.* for every thousand people, and therefore produce about 18,000*l.* in all.

It must be remembered that the number of benefices and of clergymen here given, is not stationary, but continually increasing. In 1835, according to the Report of the Commissioners*, there were 10,718 benefices in England and Wales; there are now 12,270 †, being an increase of 1,552 in 18 years ‡, or nearly 100 *per annum*. The annual increase of late has been much more rapid than this. We find that the excess of ordinations over deaths among the clergy has been, during the last few years, about 300 *per annum*. Part of this increase is due to the additional curates supplied to populous districts by the 'Pastoral Aid' and 'Curates' societies: but it must be mainly referred to the creation of new parochial districts. This is evident, because the total number of curates is now less than it was in 1835, having then been 5,320, according to the Report of the Commissioners. While mentioning this, we cannot but congratulate the Church on the immense improvement indicated by the fact that in 1835 there were more than 4,000 curates of *non-resident* incumbents, and only 1,000 of resident incumbents; whereas there are now only 1,800 curates of *non-residents*, and more than 3,000 curates assisting resident incumbents. It must farther be remarked that the new benefices, while swelling the nominal revenues of the Church, are constantly lessening the average wealth of the clergy, being for the most part provided with the smallest possible endowment.

The above may suffice as a rough estimate of the Parochial Revenues of the Establishment. There remain the Episcopal and Capitular incomes, concerning which the information is

* First Report of the Commissioners on Ecclesiastical Revenues, 1835.

† In order to ascertain the number of benefices, and their aggregate value from the Clergy List, it is necessary to add up 245 closely printed pages of figures, a task which took the accountant whom we employed four days. We recommend the publishers of this useful work to give the totals, in future, at the foot of each page.

‡ According to Lord Blandford (speech, p. 29.), the new incumbencies formed under Sir R. Peel's Act, and the Church Building Acts, have amounted only to 1,190. The remainder of the new benefices created since 1835, must (we suppose) have originated in the signment of parochial districts (under 1 & 2 Will. 4. c. 38) to new churches, or to chapels previously existing. But perhaps, the number 1,552 given in the text is rather beyond the real increase, because a few proprietary chapels, and a few benefices annexed by statutes to certain superior preferments, were omitted in the list of benefices given in the report of 1835, and are included in the 'Clergy List.'

perhaps more precise, but also more complicated, being derivable from various Reports of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and sundry Parliamentary Returns. It is not necessary however, for our present purpose, to ascertain with precision the actual revenues of the existing bishops and chapters; for these are in a state of transition, some under the old law, some under the new. As our wish is to give an estimate of the permanent financial condition of the Establishment, we may neglect this state of transition, and suppose all these revenues to be upon the system under which, by the operation of the existing law, they will speedily fall. The Episcopal Fund will then be 152,300*l.* (as fixed by an order in council issued in 1853), charged with the maintenance of twenty-seven archbishops and bishops, Sodor and Man not being included. The Capitular Fund may be reckoned at a little under 212,000*l.** when the Act 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113. shall have taken full effect.

From the episcopal and capitular estates will also be obtained, when they are properly managed, a much larger income than they at present yield. This has been already effected to some extent; and Lord Blandford calculates that ultimately a surplus of 445,000*l.* a year, applicable to parochial purposes (including the payment of archdeacons), may be derived from this source. Perhaps this estimate may be too sanguine; but as our wish is not to understate the revenues of the Church, we will take it as correct. Thus we shall have from the estates in question a total income of 809,000*l.*, of which 364,000*l.* will be devoted to the support of bishops and dignitaries, and the remainder to parochial uses. Hence the whole clerical revenues, when they are improved to the utmost possible extent, may amount to 4,397,000*l.* per annum. At present they fall short of this, by about a quarter of a million. *

In the ecclesiastical (though not in the clerical) revenues, we must also include the sum raised by church rates, for the maintenance and repair of parochial churches. This amounted (according to a Parliamentary Return) to 506,812*l.* in the year 1839 †; since that time there has been no farther return; but the amount is known to have very greatly diminished, by the refusal of rates in many parishes. The final judgment of the

* Of this sum, the charge for deaneries is about 35,000*l.*, for canonries about 90,000*l.*, and the remainder is for minor canonries, choirs, organists, and repairs. But it is not worth while to dwell on details which will so soon be subjected to the revision of Parliament on the report of the Cathedral Commissioners.

† Strictly speaking, only 363,103*l.* of this was derived from church rates, and the remainder from other sources, *e. g.* local endowments.

House of Lords in the Braintree case, which reverses the decisions of the courts of law whereby the minority was authorised to make a rate, will no doubt reduce still further the funds hitherto derived from this branch of income.

Such are the sources and the amount * of those revenues which have formed the subject of so much recent legislation and discussion.† Concerning their future management, schemes of all kinds have been broached, and opinions of all shades propounded, from those of Messrs. Peto and Miall, who wish to confiscate the funds of the Establishment altogether, to those of Sir R. Inglis, who trembles at the idea of altering the original appropriation of a sixpence. We shall not now enter into the great controversy between the advocates of the general principle of religious endowment, and the adherents of the (so-called) voluntary system. Those who have not been convinced by the reasoning of Dr. Arnold and Dr. Chalmers, are not likely to be moved from their opinion by any new arguments which we could adduce. But all honest ‡ politicians, whichever side they take in this controversy, must agree in the proposition, that it is desirable, so long as ecclesiastical revenues are appropriated to their present purposes, to make them as efficient as possible in promoting the ends to which they are devoted. This proposition has been the basis of nearly all those proposals which have been lately advocated in Parliament. It has been assumed as

* In this amount we have not included pew rents as a separate item, but we have included them in the parochial revenues (see the first note on this Article). It must not be forgotten, however, that they are simply voluntary contributions, and could not be transferred by Parliament; and that their existence is exceptional, and contrary to the theory of our Ecclesiastical Law.

† One of the most moderate and least inaccurate writers against the Establishment, Mr. Allen, who has published a work on 'State Churches,' in the present year, reckons the revenues of the Church at *seven millions*, and quotes other estimates which raise them to *nine millions*. To show the extent of Mr. Allen's acquaintance with his subject, it is sufficient to mention that he assumes the value of the glebe not to be included in the Commissioners' Report of 1835, and gives a conjectural valuation of it, which he *adds* to the net value of the benefices. The gross misstatements circulated concerning the ecclesiastical revenues show how desirable it is that accurate official returns should be published, as we trust they soon will be.

‡ We say 'honest politicians,' for we cannot apply this epithet to those who avow their wish to keep up all the abuses of the Establishment, and to render it as inefficient for religious ends as possible, in the hope of disgusting the people with the principle of Establishment. This is surely to do evil that good may come.

the object of our Church reformers, to remove from the actual administration of ecclesiastical property every defect which tends to diminish the efficiency, or lower the character of the clergy, and (in the words of Lord Blandford's preamble) 'to render such estates and revenues most productive and beneficial to the Established Church, and most conducive to the spiritual welfare of the people.' To effect this end, various methods have been recommended. Many measures of practical usefulness have been carried, others have been proposed, and more may be suggested. On the other hand, many mistakes have been committed, many useless nostrums prescribed, many falsehoods too eagerly swallowed by the public. The fundamental fallacy, whence most other errors have sprung, is a belief that the motives of the clergy would be made more pure, and their labours more effectual, by diminishing the wealth of the Establishment, and abolishing what are called (in the phraseology of Mammon) the 'prizes' of the Church. 'A poor and virtuous clergy,' is the watchword of a large and well meaning party of ecclesiastical reformers, who suppose that clerical virtue and clerical poverty go together. We hope that we have in some degree contributed to dispel this delusion, by our recent description of the poorest, but certainly not the most virtuous section of the English hierarchy, the peasant clergy of the mountains. But before we go further, it will be well to say something more as to this excessive wealth attributed to the Church. We have just shown that its total amount is between four and five millions sterling; a sum which, though insignificant when compared with the resources of the country (being less than the produce of the income tax of 7*d.* in the pound on the wealthy classes) is yet in itself a considerable revenue. But when we remember the numbers among whom it is divided, and that the average share of each is less than 300*l.* per annum, it cannot be considered a very exorbitant remuneration for the services of educated men; and we can scarcely agree with the 'Times' that 'the vast wealth of our Church is, in one sense, its greatest misfortune.'* The emoluments of the parochial clergy, at all events, will not excite the envy of any well-paid bagman. It is true, that some of them have more than the above average dividend; and the 'Times' tells us with horror that 'the world hears of livings of 1000*l.* a year!'+ But the shock which our minds receive at first hearing of an income so enormous as this, may perhaps be diminished by a little investigation. Let us take the case mentioned by the 'Times' of one of these le-

* 'Times,' June 22. 1853.

† Ibid.

viathans of clerical opulence. Let us examine the actual receipts of a rector who scandalises the world by pocketing 1000*l.* per annum from the Church. In the first place, the repeal of the Corn Laws has caused a fall of 10 per cent. in the tithe-rent-charge, so that a tithe-owner endowed with 1000*l.* a year of rent-charge now only receives 900*l.* This reduction, notwithstanding the present high range of prices, may not have yet reached its maximum; but we will confine ourselves to the present state of things, and suppose our wealthy incumbent still to possess a clerical income of 900*l.* a year. From this are to be deducted the poor rates, amounting to 130*l.* per annum, the way rates, amounting to 15*l.*, and the expenses of collection (at 3 per cent.), amounting to 30*l.** Moreover his parish being large (as it must be to yield so much tithe), he will generally be obliged to keep an assistant curate. In fact, we find from the Clergy List that for every three livings of 1000*l.* per annum, four curates are kept. Hence if we suppose only one required, we are below the average. This involves a further charge of 100*l.* a year upon his income. The above deductions bring down the rector's nominal 1000*l.* a year to an actual 625*l.* We must remember also that these charges on professional income fall upon the clergy alone. For example, the brother of our rector is judge of a county court, who has the same nominal income as the clergyman, viz. 1000*l.* per annum. But upon that income no rates are charged, and out of it he pays nothing for assistants. If there be more work in his district than one judge can do, two are appointed, and the salary of the second is not subtracted from the salary of the first. It is true, on the other hand, that the barrister has to pay house-rent, while the rector has only to keep his parsonage in repair. We may put this as a disadvantage against the barrister of 50*l.* per annum. Thus, while the net income of the rector is 625*l.*, that of the barrister will be 950*l.*, although their nominal incomes (and their income tax) are the same. But the difference is in reality still greater than this. For the whole charities of an extensive parish require from the wealthy rector a liberal support. He must subscribe to the parochial friendly societies, to the lying-in-charity, to the coal charity, to the clothing club, to the choristers, to the bell-ringers. He must maintain the national school (at an expense of 20*l.* or 30*l.* at the least) and must give largely to the relief of all the casual distress

* The deductions here given are those actually paid upon a tithe-rent charge of 1000*l.* in a case with which we are acquainted. The charge for poor rates is taken on the average of the last seven years.

and permanent poverty by which he is surrounded. Besides this there are innumerable claims upon his purse, from institutions and societies for the promotion of various benevolent and religious objects, local, provincial, diocesan, and metropolitan. He must subscribe to the county hospital, the diocesan training school, the Christian Knowledge Society, the Missionary Society, and the National School Society. Besides these necessary things, there will be voluntary offerings expected from him, dependent on his theological party; if he is a Low Churchman, he must contribute for the conversion of the Jews; if a Tractarian, for the conversion of the archbishop. Meanwhile we had almost forgotten that Mr. Christopher Hodgson will summon him annually to pay the *tenths* of his benefice to Queen Anne's Bounty Office; and that he will also be compelled to excuse several of his poorer parishioners from the payment of their tithes. If he be a man of average liberality, these various claims will subtract at the least another 100*l.* a year from his income. Meanwhile his legal brother discharges his conscience and more than satisfies all expectations, by the disbursement of 10*l.* per annum in charitable donations. Thus our fortunate incumbent will have about 525*l.* of net income, out of which he must pay 29*l.* (the income tax on 1000*l.*) to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and congratulate himself that he has still nearly 500*l.* remaining for the maintenance of his household and the education of his family.

Such is an accurate account of the professional receipts of the wealthiest among the parochial clergy. But, to appreciate 'the vast wealth of our Church' as it deserves, it must be remembered that there are only 174 livings which amount to 1000*l.* a year; that there are only a thousand which amount to 500*l.* a year; and that out of the whole number of 12,270 benefices, more than 8000 are below 300*l.* a year. Hence two-thirds of the parochial incumbents receive less than 300*l.* per annum from their profession, and out of this they are often compelled, by the large population of their parishes, to maintain an assistant; and below these there are nearly 5000 curates, whose salary does not average above 100*l.* a year. If the clergy are not actually sunk in such poverty as this, it is because they possess, in most cases, a private fortune equal in amount to their professional income, and often far exceeding it.

But some will say that if the parochial clergy are too poor, the dignitaries of the Church are too rich; and that bishops, deans, and canons absorb the revenues which ought to be distributed among their more needy brethren. To this we may reply, in the first place, that the abolition of all these dignities

would only put an additional 360,000*l.* a year at our disposal; and that, supposing this sum divided among the 13,000 * clergy (incumbents and curates) whose income is below 300*l.*, it would only give each of them 27*l.* a year more than he has at present; an addition which would make no appreciable difference in their position. But again, we deny that the dignities of the Church are unreasonably endowed, as compared with the highest posts in other professions. The 28 † bishops and archbishops have incomes (under the new system) of about 5000*l.* each. Now there are 22 judges in the Courts of Chancery, Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, with average salaries of about 6000*l.* Moreover the number of barristers (as appears from the Law List of 1853) is below 4000; whereas the number of clergy is above 18,000. So that while more than 4 barristers in 1000 are elevated to the Bench, scarcely more than one clergyman in 1000 attains the mitre. At present the Church and Bar are recruited from the same classes of society, by men who are subjected to the same education, and pass through school and college side by side. We do not see why we should grudge to the heads of one profession the position which no one grudges to the heads of the other. ‡ But if the episcopal incomes are not unreasonably large, still less can the secondary dignities, the deaneries and canonries, be thought too highly endowed. The income of the deaneries is fixed for the future at an average of 1000*l.* each. § Under these are 4 canonries in each cathedral, averaging at present 600*l.* each. Besides these are 70 archdeacons, 8 of whom hold canonries, and the rest receive on the average only 150*l.* each. Compare these emoluments with those of masters in Chancery, bankruptcy commissioners, county court judges, and police magistrates, and we shall again find that the Bar has a great advantage, even in nominal emoluments, over the Church.

But to this it may be replied, that the prizes of the Bar are always given, if not to the worthiest, at any rate to the worthy; and that it is scarcely possible to bestow such patronage on a

* Besides the 4,885 curates, there are 8,230 incumbents receiving less than 300*l.* a year; which makes 13,115 in all with less than 300*l.* a year.

† Including Sodor and Man.

‡ If we compare another profession of similar education, that of Physic, we find (from Dr. Hope's statement in his Life) that a London physician in good second-rate practice makes 4000*l.* a year. The heads of the profession make much more.

§ By 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113. Four deaneries are to have more than this, but six or seven others have at present less.

barrister totally incompetent; while, on the other hand, the high places of the Church have been too often filled by men who had no claim whatever except political connexion or personal servility. We must acknowledge the truth of this charge as applying to the past; and it fully accounts for the difference of feeling with which the dignities of the two professions are regarded by the public. But it should be remembered that if Church appointments have been bad, it is the fault of the advisers of the Crown, and therefore the fault of the Parliament and of the nation, which has regarded such appointments not with indignation but with apathy. A better spirit is now aroused, and the appointments made during the last ten years have been, for the most part, highly creditable. There is every reason to hope that the improved tone of public opinion will continue to enlighten the conscience of cabinet ministers, and to purify the fountains of preferment.

But though it be granted that the dignities of the Church are not excessive either in number or in wealth, considered as the prizes of a secular profession, still it may be argued that the existence of such prizes interferes with the spiritual interests of the Church. It is well (it may be said) that the labours of the barrister, the soldier, or the physician should be animated by the hopes of wealth and the aspirations of ambition; but the minister of religion should need no such earthly stimulants to rouse his sense of duty, and his zeal should be kindled at a holier altar than that of Mammon. We entirely sympathise in these sentiments, and freely acknowledge that if the abolition of the high offices of the Church would purify the motives of her ministers, or if, as a general rule, they were induced to enter their profession by the hope of rank and wealth, we should gladly instal Messrs. Bright and Horsman as Ecclesiastical Commissioners, with full powers to abate the redundant opulence of the hierarchy. But, if we examine the facts, we shall find that the supposed motives do not really influence the clergy to any appreciable extent. Much misapprehension has been caused on this subject by one of the cleverest of Sydney Smith's writings, his inimitable 'Letters to Archdeacon Sin-'gleton.' This, like all his works, combines sparkling wit with clear-headed common sense; but the latter quality sometimes overleaps itself, and intrudes into regions where shrewdness is not the supreme arbiter of truth. For too much knowledge of the world may sometimes as far mislead a man as too little; the motives of the simple may be hidden from the crafty by their very craft; as a lighted candle in a man's hand will blind him to the stars in the heavens. Thus when Sydney

Smith gauges the motives of eighteen thousand country clergymen by the standard measure which he would apply to three or four hundred London barristers, his knowledge of the world does not save him from showing an ignorance of human nature. He starts with an assumption that the clergy are induced to take Orders by the hope of gaining high preferment. They are all competitors in a game of chance, where the blanks are curacies and the prize a mitre. 'The whole income of the Church,' he says, 'if equally divided, would be about 250*l.* for each minister. Who would go into the Church, and spend 1200*l.* or 1500*l.* on his education, if such were the highest remuneration he could ever look to? At present men are tempted into the Church by the prizes of the Church.* And he compares this to the case of the Bar, where 'each man hopes to be a Scarlett or a Brougham, and takes out his ticket in a lottery where the mass must infallibly lose, trusting to his good fortune, and believing that the prize is reserved for him, disappointment for others. So it is with the Clergy.† And again he says: 'By the old plan of paying by lottery, not only do you obtain a parochial clergy upon much cheaper terms, but from the gambling propensities of human nature, and the irresistible tendency to hope that they shall gain the great prizes, you tempt men into your service who keep up their credit and yours not by your allowance, but by their own capital.* * * * If I was writing in gala and parade, I would not hold this language; but we are in earnest, and on business. * * * We must get down at once to the solid rock, without heeding how we disturb the turf and the flowers above.‡ Thus it appears that the 'solid rock' on which the Church is founded, is the love of money, which has erroneously been called *the root of all evil*. This is surely the most original of all the manifold interpretations of that controverted text, *Super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam*.

Now, we freely own that if this were a true representation of the Establishment, we should be exceedingly inclined to echo the battle-cry of Dissent, 'Down with her, down with her, even unto the ground.' But it requires only a slight acquaintance with the ordinary specimens of clerical humanity, to show that Sydney Smith's view is founded only on exceptional instances. We must, indeed, take his word for it, that he was himself actuated by the motives which he describes; and we may acknowledge that a certain number of able and ambitious men,

* First Letter to Singleton.

† Ibid.

‡ Third Letter to Singleton.

in every generation, are brought into the ministry of the Church by similar calculations. But this number is very small, in comparison with those who are attracted by influences wholly different. The prizes in a lottery can excite the hopes of those only who have taken the tickets; and the ticket-holders in Smith's ecclesiastical lottery must necessarily be few. In other words, the great majority of clergymen are ordained with the full knowledge that they cannot by possibility obtain any of the higher dignities. These prizes, so far as they are 'open to competition' at all, are open only to those who are qualified to compete for them by literary distinction, or by aristocratic connexion. Men who possess either of these qualifications, may be suspected of entering the Church for the sake of its deaneries and bishoprics. But how many are these, out of the 18,000 clergymen of England? If we said that one in twenty thought himself possessed of such claims, that he would be disappointed if he passed through life without gaining an ecclesiastical dignity, we should greatly exaggerate the number. We cannot doubt, if we look at facts, that the great mass of the existing clergy entered upon their profession with a full knowledge of their prospects. They originally expected and calculated on that lot which they have subsequently obtained. *

No doubt, however, Sydney Smith is right in his assertion, that the actual income derived by the majority of clergymen from their profession, is a motive quite inadequate to explain their adopting such a line of life. He says, truly, that the money spent on their education might have been more profitably invested in trade. And he farther calls attention to the remarkable fact (which he was the first to point out,) that the average private fortune of the clergy exceeds their professional income. He takes seven clergymen promiscuously, in his own neighbourhood, and finds that the aggregate of their permanent income, from private sources, amounts to about the same as the aggregate of their clerical income from church preferment. We have ourselves made a similar estimate, and found that in twelve adjacent parishes, the total ecclesiastical income of the incumbents was 4,200*l.*, and the total private income 6,400*l.* And we believe, that it would be found generally, that Sydney Smith's calculation underrates the usual proportion of a clergyman's private to his professional resources. In order to form a rough estimate of the real circumstances of the case, let any one look round his neighbourhood, and observe how few of the clergy can be considered as living at the rate of less than 500*l.* a-year. Yet such an expenditure would (as we have seen) be about double the average professional income of a clergyman.

Thus the clergy, while poor as a profession, are rich as a class; a fact, which goes far to account for the popular notions of 'the vast wealth of the Church.' The advantages derived from this state of things are obvious to all men. We see them, wherever we go, in ruined parsonages rebuilt, new churches raised, and old churches restored, school-rooms erected and endowed, and rich and poor knit together by ties of kindness, which exemplify 'the mutual help and comfort which the one ought to have of the other.' Sydney Smith declares, that the wealth of these capitalists is attracted into the service of the Church on the 'lottery' principle, by 'the gambling propensities of human nature, and the irresistible tendency to hope that they will gain the great prizes.' But this is a palpable mistake; for the clergymen of private fortune are the very men who have (as a general rule) neither expectation nor wish for 'the great prizes;' and the real competitors for these rewards, the literary men, the controversialists, and the partisans, have usually little or no private fortune.

But if we reject this 'gambling' theory, we are bound to assign some other and more probable motives, which may explain the fact that so large a number of men annually devote themselves to a profession so ill remunerated. Nor shall we attempt to maintain that the great mass of the clergy adopt their calling from motives of heroic self-sacrifice. Those who are ordained in the spirit of apostles are necessarily few, because human nature does not produce heroes or saints in crops; such visitants come to us 'not in battalions, but as single spies.' A modern infidel writer, who cannot be suspected of exaggeration in favour of the Church, estimates these apostolic clergymen as 'one in fifty;' and says that, rare as they are, yet their life exhibits a self-devotion so noble, 'that they are not only enough for the salt of their class, but for the salt of the world too.*' In the next degree to these, we may reckon no inconsiderable number who have sought in the service of religion a remedy for the sorrows of life. They hope to sweeten the bitterness of their lot, by giving themselves wholly to the duties of benevolence and devotion. To preach glad tidings to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to shed light upon the darkness of the dying, seems to them the happiest destiny for a wounded spirit. Their imagination responds to the words of the clerical poet, who sings the soothing influence of ministerial duties:—

'The herbs we seek to heal our woe
Familiar by our pathway grow,
Our common air is balm.'

* Froude's *Nemesis*, p. 7.

Others again there are of shrinking and sensitive natures, who seek refuge in a sacred calling from the unsatisfying turmoil and hard-hearted selfishness of the world. They yield to the same impulse which drove so many of kindred disposition from the rough struggle of mediæval life into the shelter of the cloister. They imagine that they can escape from the strife of tongues by flying to the altar of God; though they often find, too late, that where they fled for peace they have rushed into a battle-field. More numerous than any of these classes are those who enter the profession because their unambitious temper finds in it an appropriate sphere for the exercise of moderate talent and ordinary energies. If they are animated by no vocation to a life of apostolic labour, yet they intend to do their duty to the flock which shall be committed to their charge. Without renouncing the prospect of happiness for themselves, they think also of contributing to the happiness of others. They indulge, it may be,

‘In moonlight dreams
Of love and home by mazy streams;’

visions of the ‘domus et placens uxor;’ of the snug parsonage and cheerful fireside; of smooth lawns and trelliced roses, mingle in their ideal of the future. But with such fancies are blended less selfish pictures of new school-buildings filled with peasant children; of shivering paupers clothed and comforted; of cottages made glad with Christmas dinners; of wine and oil poured into the wounds of poverty. Such candidates for ordination look forward to a routine of kindly and useful, if not laborious duties, with a respectable position in society, and a small addition to their private fortune. Many of them, moreover, being themselves the sons of clergymen, have the additional inducement of habitual association and hereditary connexion to tempt them into the profession of their fathers.

Such are the motives which, acting either separately or in combination, and often mingled in undistinguishable proportions one with another, impel so many thousands of educated men into the ministry of the Church. And if these fall short, as no doubt they do, of the ideal standard of Christian zeal, and of that necessity to preach the Gospel which was laid upon a Paul or a Bernard, yet we must remember that it is the wisdom of those who establish or maintain national institutions, to avail themselves of the ordinary laws of human nature, not to look for exceptional manifestations. The utmost which the State can demand of its officers is not a life of heroism, but a life of usefulness.

But though we deny that the clergy generally are influenced

by motives so low and selfish as those ascribed to them by Sydney Smith, we admit that there is a small minority actuated, if not by the 'gambling' spirit which he advocates, yet by views equally secular, and calculations even more definitely sordid. To this minority belong not only some active and ambitious men, who possessing ability sufficient to make themselves valuable in any profession, are called to the Church in the same spirit in which they would be called to the Bar; but many of an inferior class, whose aim is to rise without any merit at all, and whom the world designates as *clerical adventurers*. First and most conspicuous is the *Irish Fortune-hunter*, who after getting ordained in Tipperary, and serving his two years as curate among his native bogs, impatiently rushes across the Channel to seek his destined prey. He promptly advertises in the 'Record' for a 'town sphere of usefulness,' and is at length appointed assistant to the minister of a chapel in some wealthy borough, the seat of manufactures or commerce. If his face and figure aid the fascinations of his tongue, he soon wins the idolatry of his fairer hearers, and ends by marrying the richest widow in his congregation. Next we have the *Creeping Climber*, who begins life as a servitor at Oxford, with a firm determination to die a bishop; and by dint of tuft-hunting and time-serving, succeeds in crawling slowly but surely, if not to the pinnacle of the temple, at least to a snug harbour among its battlements. Then there is the *Renegade Dissenter*, perhaps the most offensive specimen of this offensive class. He is the son of a small tradesman in a country town, and being a clever lad, is patronised by the independent minister, and educated by assistance from a non-conformist charity fund. In due time he becomes himself a dissenting preacher, and saves enough out of the small gains of his profession to pay for his academical course at St. Bees. Thus qualified, he renounces his hereditary faith, takes orders in the Church, becomes hyper-orthodox in his opinions, and cuts his father who adheres to their patrimonial creed. He of course distinguishes himself by extreme violence against the sectarians whom he has deserted, and publishes tracts against schism, and dialogues defensive of the Establishment. Thus perhaps he commends himself to the notice of some weak and well-intentioned patron; and obtains the wages of apostacy in the shape of a paltry benefice and a trifling rise in social rank. Finally there is the *Society's Agent*, who spends his life in a perpetual tour, speechifying every day at some new place, and dining afterwards upon venison and claret with the chairman of the meeting. When he has employed five years in this way, he must have formed so large an acquaintance with influential people,

that it is strange if none of them is induced to provide for so good a man; especially as they are not likely to know that he has been thrice insolvent, and has ruined a whole army of small tradesmen who served him in the curacies where he ministered before commencing his itinerant career.*

We do not shrink from painting these consecrated speculators in their true colours, nor from acknowledging that they deserve all the reprobation which is poured upon them by the enemies of the Church. But we must remember that they are by no means the peculiar product of a dignified Establishment. They are incidental to every method of providing for the ministration of public worship and its functionaries, and are at least as common a fruit of the 'voluntary principle' as of State endowment. Any one who doubts this has only to examine into the working of the unendowed system in the United States of America. Indeed, there needs but little knowledge of human nature to convince us that, so long as there are ministers of religion at all, there must be some mercenary ministers. Even among the Presbyters converted by St. Paul and ordained by Timothy, there were those who made a gain of godliness.

The only peculiar product of an opulent State Church is the *Safe Man*, who if a species of the mercenary genus at all, is its least disgusting and most decorous type. He is usually distinguished in early life by academical success, which forms the appropriate basis of his subsequent career. When he has entered on the business of maturer years, he seldom ventures upon the dangerous experiment of authorship; or, if he choose that mode of launching himself upon the notice of the world, he commits himself to nothing by his publication; but edits a 'Father' without controversial notes, or publishes a volume of sermons, polished in style, and neutral in sentiment. He carefully shuns the violence of partisanship, and shrinks with horror from extreme opinions, aspiring above all things to the character of a sound and moderate divine. Thus he steadily rises in reputation, and the general favour which he attracts, advances him in due time to an archdeaconry, a professorship, a London rectory, a college headship, or some other ecclesiastical stepping stone. In the execution of his office he is regulated by the old monastic rule '*Bene loqui de superioribus, fungi officio taliter qualiter*,

* We ought to state that we by no means intend this for a description of agents of religious societies in general. Most of them are worthy men, some of them are eminently excellent; but we are here speaking of exceptional cases, and some of these agents are the vilest of the vile.

'et sinere mundum ire sicut vult mundus ire.' He does his duty in the way which best falls in with the standard of opinion in his time; and therefore, in the present time, he will do it well, but not too well. He never originates a reform in any established institution; yet he has no superstitious dislike of innovation, and if he sees that a change must come, he is quite willing 'to swell the triumph and partake the gale.' He never wilfully makes an enemy; and if as he rises, he finds it absolutely needful to drop a friend, he does it with decency; not cutting his earlier connexions, like the vulgar climber, but gradually loosening their hold upon him, and letting them slip down the stream, so that he seems rather deserted by them than deserting them; for in all his actions he is distinguished by a sense of the plausible and becoming. He marries, as he preaches, prudently; and in the whole of his well ordered life (though his prosperity may attract the assaults of envy) there is no point on which calumny can effectually fasten. At last his virtue is rewarded by the highest honours of his profession; and when the expected mitre descends upon his head, every one acknowledges that it would have been impossible for the Premier to make a 'safer' appointment. He carries his ruling principle with him to the Bench, and whether charging or speaking, preaching or voting, he is the 'safest' bishop in the House of Lords,—'*His armis illâ quoque tutus in aulâ.*' It is the grand aim of his episcopate that no man of any party may say that he would be 'dangerous' at Lambeth. If he provides for his family by his patronage, it is moderately and discreetly; from flagrant jobbery he is restrained, not merely by the fear of public censure but by gentlemanly feeling; for with all his foibles, he is still a gentleman. When at length he is laid beside his predecessors beneath the altar of his cathedral, all men must confess that his career, if it has conferred no splendid benefits on his country, has at least been serenely soothing and tranquillising to the Church. If he has done harm, it is by the omission of good, not by the perpetration of mischief.

By the abolition of the prizes of the Church, we might (it is true) eliminate the class which we have just described. The *safe man* would become an extinct variety of the clerical genus. But his place in the creation would be supplied by a degraded type. Fortune hunters of the lower and baser kinds would swarm into existence, who would add vulgarity to worldliness, and servility to ambition. On the other hand, by such a revolutionary proceeding, the nation would lose many advantages inseparably connected with the present system.

In the first place, if the bishoprics were reduced to an apos-

tolic poverty, and deprived of their temporal rank and influence, the bishops would be tempted to make up for this diminution of their importance by lofty claims of sacerdotal power. We see this result in Scotland, where nearly all the bishops are Tractarians. And even in America, notwithstanding the power of the laity in the Episcopal Church, and the anti-sacerdotal tendencies of the democratic spirit, many of the bishops have embraced the same opinions, and one of them has ended by joining the Church of Rome.

A different but not less serious evil would result from the suppression of cathedral dignities, which is a still more favourite project with many of our Church reformers than even the abasement of Prelacy. In this, as in most other cases, the thing needed is not demolition but reconstruction. The cathedrals, it must be admitted, have not hitherto been so useful as they might have been; but considered in their design and their capabilities, they are essential parts of a well-organised Establishment. It is a sufficient refutation of their wholesale denouncers to quote the judgment of Dr. Chalmers, given during the last year of his life before a Committee of the House of Commons, in the following words:—‘To such a degree am I in favour of ecclesiastical sinecures, that I should be glad to have them in our own [the ‘Free] Church.’ * * * * ‘There should be a certain number of persons of learning, maintained at leisure and endowed, for the purpose of contributing to theological literature.’ In the same passage he calls the alienation of cathedral property to parochial purposes ‘a vulgarising process.’* Such was the opinion of a man who was above all men most exempt from the temptation of exaggerating the usefulness of cathedral as compared with parochial endowments, since his whole life was spent in developing the powers of the parochial system, and since he held the parochial ministry to be the one essential function of a Church.

But the worst mischief to be feared from erasing the inequalities of the Establishment by a levelling process, would be the effect of such a measure in repelling from the Church a large proportion of those classes from which she now derives her most serviceable recruits. We have seen how many of the clergy bring into their profession a larger income than they derive from it; and we have endeavoured to show that Sydney Smith was mistaken in his assertion that they were allured by the attraction which the ‘prizes of the Church’ held out to ‘the gambling propensities of their nature.’ Nevertheless we believe him to be

right in supposing that if these prizes were removed, the great majority of such men would be repelled. For if the outward *prestige* and splendour of the Establishment were thus destroyed, it would soon lose the reputation of being a 'gentlemanly' profession, which it now enjoys; it would sink to the condition of the Presbyterian Kirk in Scotland, a body which is recruited almost exclusively from the lower ranks of society, and which consequently does not exercise that influence over the higher and more educated classes which ought to belong to a national establishment. The increase of the social rank and influence of the English clergy in the last hundred years is a very curious phenomenon, and its causes have not hitherto been satisfactorily explained. Mr. Macaulay, it is true, has shown that at the time of the Revolution the extreme poverty of the benefices accounts for the low standing of the parochial clergy; that poverty preventing them, under the circumstances of the time, from obtaining a decent education. And we lately endeavoured to illustrate his view, by showing that the actual condition of the Mountain clergy, whose circumstances approach most nearly to those which then existed, still presents the same features which he describes.* But it would be a great mistake to infer from this that the increased value of ecclesiastical property accounts for the immense change in the position of the clergy. The cause is quite disproportionate to the effect. It is true that the value of the tithe has increased in a more rapid proportion than that of the rent, so that where the income of the parson would have been a twentieth of the income of the squire in Charles the Second's time, it is now a twelfth of it. But it is still not such, in nine cases out of ten, as to secure the services of a gentleman. This is evident when we recollect that (not to mention the 5000 curates) the income of 8000 incumbents is below 300*l.* a year, that is, below the ordinary salary of a banker's clerk. Nor again is it any explanation of the phenomenon in question to say that it results from the improvement of the clergy in refinement and intelligence; for this very improvement depends in great measure on the wealth of those classes from which the Church is recruited; inasmuch as the preliminary training at public school and university is a very expensive luxury, as many fathers can testify. The real cause which has poured so many recruits of higher standing into the ranks of the clergy, is to be found in the great increase (if it should not be rather called the creation) of a class which scarcely existed two hundred years ago, the *upper-middle* class of English society. If we travel from

* See article on "Church in the Mountains," No. 198.

London, or any other great town, into the country, we pass hundreds upon hundreds of houses whose look tells us that they must be occupied by families with incomes ranging from 500*l.* to 1500*l.* a year.* As the wealth of England has grown, these households have become more numerous, year by year; and with the growth of civilisation and intelligence, their wealth has enabled them to procure a better and better education. The sorts of such families now form the majority of the English clergy. The motives which lead these men into orders we have already endeavoured to explain. And it is easy to see the causes which would neutralise these motives if the revolutionary proposals which we are discussing were carried into effect. Those among them who are urged to the work of evangelists by apostolic zeal, would still embrace the sacred calling; but the greater part would probably shrink from a profession which would then be stigmatised as plebeian by the vulgar rich; and, at all events, their parents and guardians would discourage them from entering it. Every one whose acquaintance extends beyond the Tweed is aware how reluctantly a Scotch country gentleman would see his son become a Presbyterian minister. It would be difficult to exaggerate the injury inflicted on the State, by the repulsion of the most educated and influential clergy from the Church.

In exchange for this public loss, the gain sought by the advocates of ecclesiastical equality is the improvement of small livings and the relief of indigent curates. We have already shown that, by confiscating the episcopal and capitular revenues, they might raise the income of those clergy who have less than 300*l.* a year by 27*l.* apiece. We suppose that every one would admit the uselessness of such a paltry augmentation. But perhaps there may be some who would prefer to leave the poor incumbents in their poverty, and bestow the fruits of confiscation upon the still poorer curates. They may urge that 360,000*l.* divided among the 4885 curates would give above 70*l.* to each. And they might justly consider it worth an effort to raise the remuneration of these labourers from 100*l.* to 170*l.* per annum, on the assumption that they are doomed to continue for life in their present post. So strange is the ignorance prevalent on ecclesiastical subjects, that there are doubtless many who believe this to be the case. In popular works of amusement (Mr. Dickens's *Household Words* is an example) we find it often assumed that curates are a race of clerical helots,

* The returns to the Income Tax furnish a more exact mode of ascertaining the great and increasing numbers of this class.

who never rise, except by some wonderful stroke of fortune, to the condition of their masters. A recent article in 'The Times' confirms this impression as follows: 'It is by the merest chance in the world that a curate is ever anything else than a curate, or that he ever receives more than the highest prize of his class, a house and 120*l.* a year.* It would be exactly as true to say 'it is by the merest chance in the world that a midshipman is ever anything else than a midshipman.' The cases are precisely parallel. Every vicar and rector, canon, dean, and bishop in the Church, was originally a curate, unless he happened to be fellow of a college when he was ordained. Either a curacy or a fellowship is a necessary prerequisite to ordination, for no one can be ordained at once to a benefice. It is true that there are men to be found who never rise beyond a curacy; as there are grey-headed midshipmen occasionally to be seen in the navy. But the former case is quite as rare as the latter; promotion is the rule, non-promotion the exception, in both professions. Out of the 4885 curates now in England, we much doubt whether there are 400 to be found above the age of fifty; and of these, some are men of fortune who remain curates from choice; and nine in ten of the remainder are kept down by their own demerit. The aged and exemplary clergyman, starving on a miserable stipend with a sickly wife and ten hungry children, though common in fiction is a rarity in fact. No doubt there are starving curates to be found, but they are the victims of their own imprudence. If a man with an income of 100*l.* a year, whether he be curate, ensign, or midshipman, chooses to marry at twenty-five, and to have ten children by thirty-five, he cannot expect to live in affluence, or to bring up his family in comfort. And the same imprudence and want of principle which has brought him into this condition will probably render him inefficient in his profession, and unlikely to deserve preferment. So far from curates forming a separate 'class' (as 'The Times' calls them), they share in all the interests and opinions, sympathies and prejudices, of their beneficed brethren. We have no doubt that Sydney Smith is perfectly correct when he says that 'if you were to gather a parliament of curates, on the hottest Sunday in the year, after all the services, sermons, burials, and baptisms of the day were over, and to offer them such increase of salary as would be produced by the confiscation of the cathedral property, they would reject the measure.†

* 'Times,' June 22. 1853.

† We read this sentence of Sydney Smith's the other day to a

But does not the existence of these rich prizes in the Church encourage an avaricious spirit in the clergy? The best answer to this question is another: Are the clergy, taken as a body, distinguished for avarice? We suppose the universal answer would be, that they are generally remarkable for qualities the reverse of this—for ignorance of the world, unbusiness-like habits, and liability to imposition. Faults and follies they have in abundance; bigotry, prejudice, and narrowness of mind, have been clerical failings from time immemorial; but no one can justly accuse them of grasping rapacity. On this point we might call in the evidence of the London beggars, who are attracted to every man in a black coat and white neckcloth, by an instinctive knowledge that he belongs to a class which they have the right to victimise. Or, again, we might quote the testimony of her Majesty's School Inspectors to the fact that if the poor in the country districts are educated at all, it is mainly at the expense of the clergyman. But a more general and striking proof has lately been given of the pecuniary disinterestedness of this profession. In the year 1836, the income of the parochial clergy was commuted into a rent-charge, which was fixed for ever at the same number of bushels of corn. Within ten years occurred the repeal of the corn laws. By the combined effect of both measures, the income of the clergy was inevitably reduced, without the possibility of any compensation, such as they might have had under the old law, from the effects of improved cultivation. Mr. Cobden, in a letter to a clergyman, published (if we remember rightly) in 1848, stated that *he had always said that the clergy would be the only ultimate losers by the repeal of the corn laws*; but advised them nevertheless not to oppose a measure so beneficial to their fellow countrymen *for the sake of increasing their own luxuries*. This advice was substantially wise and right. Before he gave it, however, the clergy had already adopted the disinterested course which he recommended; for neither before nor since the repeal of the corn laws was there any clerical agitation, nor a single clerical petition, against the measure. We do not believe that any other class would have borne so quietly a change which so largely mulcted their professional income.

But it may be said that, although the general body of the clergy is free from the imputation of avarice, yet the holders of the great dignities and lordly sees are led astray by the deceit-

gentleman who has remained a curate for the unusually long period of ten years. 'Reject it!' he exclaimed, 'to be sure we should, by 'ninety-nine voices out of a hundred.'

fulness of riches. And the ruthless onslaught lately made upon two of the bishops, for alleged misappropriation of Church funds, by the chief organ of the press, has tended to fix this opinion in the public mind. We may admit that no method could have been devised more certain to lead to injurious consequences than that adopted by Parliament in 1836* (now happily abandoned) for the regulation of episcopal incomes. It was intended that the bishops should receive a certain salary, and it was enacted that they should pay over a fixed sum (the supposed surplus of their revenue over that intended income) to the Ecclesiastical Commission. The Commissioners underrated the value of the sees of Durham and Salisbury, and assessed them at so low a payment that the two bishops have received an income much larger than Parliament had intended. But this assessment, once made, could not (until the recent change in the law) be legally altered in the lifetime of the respective bishops. The surplus, though erroneously given them, was their legal property. The charge against them is that they did not at once hand over this surplus to the Commissioners. But it must be remembered that their income was fluctuating, and that they knew not whether the surplus of one year might not be cancelled by the deficit of the next. It might well have happened (as it did in Egypt) that seven fat years should be swallowed up by seven lean. We may wish, indeed, that when experience showed a continued surplus, these prelates had presented it to the public, instead of spending it (as they did) upon the charities of their own dioceses. But it is a calumnious exaggeration to say, as their assailants have said, that because they failed to show this degree of liberality, they were guilty of conduct 'which would exclude a merchant from the Stock Exchange.'† We admit, however, that the former method of fixing the episcopal incomes produced bad effects, and exposed the bishops to the suspicion, if not to the temptation, of avarice. But we must remember that the system censured belongs to the past, and has been superseded by the assignment of fixed payments to future prelates. We have already endeavoured to show that the incomes so given cannot be considered inordinate, when compared with the standard of other professions. We may add that munificent donations to all religious and charitable objects are expected from the bishops, both by their own dioceses and by the public; and that such expectations are hardly ever disappointed.

* By 6 and 7 Will. 4. c. 77.

† These were the words of Mr. Peto in the House of Commons, May 26. 1853, and were echoed by 'The Times,' June 21.

We have thus attempted to expose the fallacies involved in some popular schemes of Church reform. But we are far from thinking that no reform is needed in our ecclesiastical economy. Much indeed has been done during the last twenty years, but more remains to do. It is gratifying, however, to see every indication that the changes still required are now likely to be effected with less hesitation than formerly. The feeling of Parliament on these subjects responds to the wishes of the public, and is ready to welcome every well considered project of improvement. The measure which has attracted most notice among those recently brought forward, is that of Lord Blandford, which stands at the head of our article. We observed with great satisfaction the general assent given by all parties in the House of Commons to the principle of this Bill. Its object is to relieve the bishops and other dignitaries in future to be appointed, from the management of their estates, and to place the property under the administration of the 'Estates Commissioners,' who are empowered to apply the surplus, after paying the dignitaries in question, towards the parochial necessities of the Church, as they may judge most expedient.* It has been objected to this measure that it gives to the three Estates Commissioners powers too great to be wielded by so small a body of officials. But this we regard as one of the most valuable features of the Bill. It does in fact create a rudimentary *department of ecclesiastical affairs*; but with this advantage over a ministerial department, that the board would be independent of all party influence, its members being appointed for life. The small number of the board is also a recommendation, because it secures their acting with a due sense of individual responsibility. We should see the adoption of this measure with peculiar pleasure, because it is obviously a step towards the reestablishment of some instrument of Church government intermediate between Parliament and the clergy. We have from time to time taken occasion to point out how much such an instrument is needed. Its best form would, perhaps, be a body of representatives (whereof not less than half should be laymen), elected by the members of the Church of England. This might retain the ancient name, without the defects, of Convocation. The changes ratified by such an assembly would command greater confidence than if they were decreed by Downing Street. But the form of such a council matters little, compared with its functions. Some organ of the kind is absolutely necessary, both to prepare Church

* See clauses 15. and 17. of the Bill.

measures for the sanction of Parliament, and to superintend their execution. Till it exists, there can be no thorough reform in our ecclesiastical machinery.

One of the earliest objects of the attention of such a board, whether created by Lord Blandford's Bill or by any other plan, ought to be the education of the poorer clergy. The existing means provided for this object are wholly inadequate. The Mountain clergy, though their need is the greatest, are not the only section of the profession which suffers from the same deficiency. Probably few persons are aware of the very rapid increase of the non-academic clergy during the last few years. We have ascertained that, in 1851, the total number of deacons ordained was 573, and the total increase of clergy (*i. e.* the excess of ordinations over deaths) was 295. Again, in 1852, the number ordained was 607, and the increase of clergy 320.* In each year, nearly two-thirds of the increase consisted of men who had neither been at Oxford nor Cambridge. Thus the Church is being rapidly recruited with ministers who are destitute of the moral and social advantages (which are worth far more than the intellectual advantages) of academic life. It is true, that a few among the number enjoy these advantages at Durham, and in a less perfect degree at Lampeter†; but from the rest they are wholly withheld. This is a state of things which ought not to continue. It is doubtless most important to create and endow new parishes; but it is equally important that the ministers provided for such parishes should not disgrace themselves in the eyes of their parishioners by incompetence or vulgarity. At present the education of the national schoolmasters, trained at St. Mark's and Kneller Hall,

* In 1851, the new deacons were 202 of Cambridge, 201 of Oxford, and 170 of neither. In 1852, they were 232 of Cambridge, 204 of Oxford; and 171 of neither. We have compiled these returns from the lists of ordinations given in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

† The recommendation lately given in this Review for conferring extended privileges on Lampeter has been since adopted (at least in part) by the Government. We have acknowledged on a former occasion the benefits conferred upon the northern districts by that noble foundation. It is not impossible that Marlborough College, which is at present chartered for the education of the sons of the clergy, might, by a slight extension of its plan, be made to serve the same purpose for the south of England which Durham serves for the north; and the character of its present Master (Dr. Cotton) would be a guarantee against that perversion of clerical education to party objects which has ruined similar schemes elsewhere.

is incomparably better than that obtained by three-fourths of the non-academic clergy.

The need of a regular provision for this novel state of things is shown by a phenomenon peculiar to the present day. Colleges for the education of this new class of clergy are established, not by public authority, but by private adventure. A clergyman begins by taking a few pupils, whom he prepares for ministerial functions, by a course of parochial visiting, and 'Pearson on the Creed.' After a time he persuades a bishop to ordain one or two of these pupils without requiring them to take a university degree. The next step is to call his parsonage 'the College of Saint Ignotus,' and to advertise it in the newspapers as a new theological seminary. If a good-natured bishop will consent to be nominated as 'visitor,' the scheme is complete. Candidates for cheap ordination flock to the halls of St. Ignotus; the projector dubs himself Provost, Warden, or President; and a self-created dignitary is added to the Church. We do not say that this is always done from unworthy motives; it may be well to supply an urgent need even by irregular means. But the wants of the Church ought to be met by the deliberate and collective action of her official authorities, not left to the chance-medley of individual speculation.

Another reform demanded by the interest of these poor candidates for the ministry, is the abolition of the enormous ordination fees now exacted by bishop's secretaries. The solicitor who acts in this capacity supplies every clergyman ordained with a small piece of parchment, sealed with the bishop's seal, and called a 'letter of orders.' Before the end of his first twelvemonth, the young curate must pay from 7*l.* to 10*l.**, (*i. e.* about a tenth of his year's salary) for a couple of these documents, including his licence. A single London solicitor is secretary to twenty-three bishops, and receives these fees from about 500 clergy, annually; that is, he derives 4,000*l.* or 5,000*l.* a-year, from this tax upon poverty. These charges admit of no justification. The letters of orders (which, perhaps, cost a shilling apiece) ought to be gratuitously given by the bishop. Indeed, we think it questionable whether the ordination fees are not illegal under the Act 31 Eliz. c. 6., which imposes penalties on those who take or pay money for ordination. Of

* The charge varies in different dioceses; in that of Worcester it is (or was very recently) 9*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.* for the two letters of orders and the licence; in the adjoining diocese of Hereford it is 7*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* for the same. No reason can be assigned for these variations.

course no blame attaches in this matter to individuals who have only adopted a system long established; but the sooner the practice is discontinued the better.

Akin to this abuse is the extravagant sum abstracted from public purposes by the fees and salaries of the solicitors who act as secretaries and officers of the Boards of Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commission. It should be remembered that these funds being devoted to the relief of spiritual destitution, are peculiarly sacred; and it is a painful spectacle to see London attorneys fattening on ecclesiastical famine.

Another important branch of our present subject will shortly be brought before Parliament by the Report of the Cathedral Commissioners. But as this report is not yet published, and as cathedral reform has recently been the theme of a separate paper in this Review, we need not now do more than refer to that Article for a discussion of the details.

The Commission on Cathedrals reminds us of another Royal Commission whose report has perhaps attracted less attention than it deserved. We refer to the Commission appointed in 1849 to consider the best mode of subdividing overgrown parishes. It has recommended the immediate formation of 580 new districts as essential to render the parochial system a reality in England. Of the desirableness of such an addition, after the details published by the Commissioners, there can be no question. But the difficulty is how to provide funds for building and endowing so many churches. The Commissioners recommend a new and rather singular expedient; the sale of the greater part of the livings, now in the gift of the Lord Chancellor.* They reckon upon raising a million from this source; and another million from private contributions. We doubt, however, whether they have sufficiently considered the depreciation which would be produced in the value of advowsons by the nearly simultaneous sale of so many. Their proposal has been objected to, from a fear lest it should injure the patronage of the Crown. In this fear we confess that we do not share. It is no doubt important to keep the great dignities in the gift of the Crown, but we do not see what advantage is gained by putting 777 livings at the disposal of the Lord Chancellor. One benefit resulting from it, is that it keeps up lay influence over the clergy; but this would be equally gained by the sale

* Lord Harrowby's Bill, which we mentioned at the beginning of this Article, adopts another recommendation of these Commissioners, applying the proceeds of the sales of the smaller Chancellor's Livings for the benefit of the particular parishes whose advowsons are sold.

of the same advowsons to private patrons. But we fear that this is a case in which official traditions are likely long to prevail over common sense.

This recommended sale of livings is connected with a subject which formed the theme of several debates in the House of Commons during the last session; we mean, the expediency of altering the laws which regulate the possession and purchase of Church patronage. This has been brought forward, by a new member of the House, Dr. Phillimore, who has shown less judgment and information on this question than his acknowledged abilities and eminent legal acquisitions would have led us to expect. In his main proposition, that the present state of the law is anomalous and absurd, and that it causes scandals which ought to be suppressed, we heartily agree with Dr. Phillimore. But to his proposed remedy we object for two reasons; first, because it would be no cure; and secondly, because, if it were, it would be worse than the disease. But, before we give our reasons for this opinion, let us recapitulate the anomalies complained of in the existing law. 1. It is legal both for laymen and clergy to purchase an *advowson*, whether the living be vacant or full, but such purchase cannot convey the presentation to a vacant living. 2. It is legal for a layman to purchase a *next presentation*, if the living be full. 3. It is illegal for a clergyman to purchase a *next presentation*. 4. It is illegal for any one to purchase a *next presentation* when the living is vacant. 5. It is legal for a clergyman to give a bond to resign a living for certain specified relatives of the patron. 6. It is illegal to give a general resignation bond. These inconsistencies are absurd enough in themselves, but appear still more monstrous when it is remembered that the transactions prohibited, though not morally differing from those sanctioned, are stigmatised as *simoniacal*. The origin of this application of that term, and of all these anomalies, is to be found in the fact, that the present state of the law represents a compromise between two antagonistic systems. It is the result of a long struggle between the Common Law and Canon Law. In fact, the questions reopened by Dr. Phillimore (himself a *Doctor Canonici Juris*, and therefore a partisan in the strife,) are fragments, so to speak, of the great contest of investitures, which so long divided the temporal and spiritual powers throughout Europe. According to the strict theory of the Canon Law, no lay patronage was recognised, but the bishop had the sole disposal of all Church offices. As a check upon his power, the rights of private patrons were created by the Common Law. The Church of Rome, during the contest of investitures, branded her opponents with the ugly stigma of

simony; and the Romanising traditions of the Canon Law have applied this nickname to transactions which have not the slightest resemblance to that sin of Simon Magus from which the term is derived. Blackstone forcibly points out this misapplication of the word, and observes that 'the true (though not the common) notion of simony,' is 'if any person obtain orders, or a licence to preach, by money or corrupt practices;' an offence which (by 31 Eliz. c. 6.) is punishable, both in the person giving and receiving such orders, by fine and incapacity of preferment. Thus it would be true simony (under this Act of Elizabeth), if a bishop were to ordain a disqualified relative for the corrupt purpose of providing him with preferment.* This 'true notion of simony,' however, has been superseded by the technical usage of the word, in which it is applied to *any illegal transfer of patronage*. Not satisfied with this extension of the term, Dr. Phillimore wishes to stretch it still farther, so as to include the sale of *next presentations*, which his Bill proposes to forbid. But this prohibition, instead of rectifying the anomalies of the law, would only introduce a new inconsistency. There are only two methods by which the law would be rendered consistent; either by absolutely prohibiting the alienation of patronage, or by legalising it without restriction. The former is the true object of that party which Dr. Phillimore represents; the party which seeks to approximate the ecclesiastical laws and customs of England as nearly as possible to those of Rome. Dr. P. himself professes for the present to respect the right of private patronage; but his adherents are less cautious. The 'Guardian' newspaper, in its vigorous articles in defence of Dr. P.'s Bill, openly declares that he does not go far enough, and that the sale of advowsons must also be made illegal. The direct consequence of this is that the right of private patronage must be abolished, for (as Paley well remarks)† patronage if inalienable from the inheritance would devolve on the most indigent and therefore the most improper hands. Moreover, the reasons alleged for prohibiting the sale of presentations apply much more forcibly against the sale of advowsons. The main argument urged by Dr. Phillimore and Lord Goderich, the two champions of the measure, was that the power of buying presentations induces men to take orders from corrupt motives. Now if this were true of the sale of present-

* One of the best examples of true simony on record is the case of a bishop in the last century, who is said to have paid his wife's gambling debt by ordaining and preferring the son of the winner.

† Moral Philosophy, book 3.

ations, it would be more true of the sale of advowsons, and most true of the permanent possession of advowsons. This will be evident, if we consider the circumstances under which the two kinds of property are held. The purchaser of an advowson becomes, from the time of the purchase, the owner of what is called a 'family living.' Thenceforward that living may be filled, as often as it falls vacant, at the discretion of himself and his representatives. Of course, it will naturally be given to some near relative, and will act as an inducement to some of the family to take orders. And the longer it is held in the same family, the oftener does it exercise this biasing influence upon the young of successive generations. On the other hand, the purchaser of a presentation buys it for some definite person, who is either already in orders, or is intending to take orders before the purchase is made. For example, a merchant has three or four sons, who have their profession to choose, and he intends to give them 5000*l.* apiece, to start them in the particular line of life which they prefer. One son chooses the army, and his portion is employed in the purchase of his commission and the subsequent steps. A second chooses to enter an attorney's office, and his money purchases him a lucrative partnership. A third prefers emigration, carries his capital with him to Australia, and returns a millionaire in twenty years. A fourth son of studious habits and devout temper wishes to become a clergyman. His father warns him that he is selecting a life of comparative poverty, and that he can invest his fortune for him better in almost any other line than in the Church. But the son adheres to his choice, and the father invests his 5000*l.* in the purchase of a presentation with prospect of early possession; by virtue of which the son succeeds, in due time, to a professional income of four or five hundred a year. Plainly he has not been induced to choose his profession by pecuniary motives, but by taste and conscious fitness; and the pecuniary advantage, such as it is, has followed upon his choice, not preceded it. It is obvious that the men who succeed to livings thus purchased will be amongst the most disinterested members of their profession. They will usually have other resources, independent of their tithes; and they will be free from the mean and odious motives which actuate the clerical adventurer, who seeks his preferment from the patronage of the bishops or the Crown. Dr. Philimore's Bill would exclude a large proportion of that most valuable class of men who (as we have before seen) bring their private fortune to eke out the pittance which they receive as the wages of their ministry.

Another point strongly urged by the advocates of this

measure, was the expediency of putting an end to these disgraceful scandals sometimes witnessed when a living in private patronage becomes unexpectedly vacant. It occasionally happens that the patron, desirous to sell the next presentation, and being forbidden by law to sell it during vacancy, presents an old man upon the brink of the grave, and thus enables himself legally to sell the presentation, with a prospect of speedy possession. Several cases of this kind have been recently brought before the public by that indefatigable agitator, Mr. S. G. Osborne. But it is strange that Dr. Phillimore did not perceive that these cases, so far from furnishing an argument for his Bill, tell directly against it. For the scandal is caused, not by legalising the sale of presentations, but by forbidding it in one particular case. If the patron could sell the presentation while the living was vacant, he would have no temptation to fill it with a broken-down old man. It would be bought, under the circumstances which we have already described, for some young clergyman who has been ordained out of preference for the clerical profession. Whereas Dr. Phillimore's Bill would not at all remedy the scandal in question; for patrons capable of conduct so disgraceful would still put in their incompetent old nominees, and sell the advowson instead of the presentation. We may add that these appointments might be prevented, without any alteration of the law, by the instituting bishop. For the patron has only the right of *presenting* a nominee; it is the bishop who must *institute*, and he is bound to refuse institution to an unfit man.* It should be farther observed that the prohibition of the present law, which prevents the sale of presentations during vacancy, is peculiarly absurd; for if they are to be sold at all, the most proper time for the sale is the vacancy of the living. There is a certain degree of gambling in the purchase of advowsons and presentations at present. The purchaser must speculate on the probable duration of the in-

* The worst case of this kind which has occurred was that of St. Ervan's in the diocese of Exeter. In this case the bishop instituted an old man in the last stage of decrepitude, who, as the bishop's secretary is forced to acknowledge, was, at the time of his induction, 'incapable personally to discharge the duties of his office,' (see Mr. Osborne's letter in 'The Times' of Aug. 20. 1853,) and who died two or three months afterwards. The Bishop of Exeter has publicly announced his determination to refuse institution to every clergyman who may agree with the theological sentiments of the Archbishop; but it appears that personal incapacity to discharge clerical duties is no bar to institution in his diocese. We presume that the palsied old presbyter of St. Ervan's was 'sound on the baptismal question.'

cumbent's life; and there is something disgusting* in the notion of an expectant watching the failing health of a possessor.

But again, it is argued by Dr. Phillimore that the right of patronage is a sacred trust, and ought to be executed conscientiously, not sold for money. Now, in the first place, this proves too much for Dr. P.'s purpose; since he permits the sale of advowsons, though he forbids that of presentations. But, moreover we cannot force patrons to be conscientious by Act of Parliament. On this point Dr. P. is guilty of a kind of moral contradiction in terms; for he assumes the would-be vendor to desire to perform an unconscientious action and yet compels him to retain a power which cannot be duly exercised but by a conscientious man. The truth is that, for the reasons already given, the purchaser of such property is likely to make a better nomination than the vendor.

It is to be regretted that these very obvious flaws in Dr. Phillimore's arguments were not exposed by any of the opponents of his measure. They took their stand on the rights of property; and Mr. Butt, the principal speaker against the Bill, represented it as 'an act of wholesale confiscation.' This was a valid objection as against the Bill in its present shape; but might be met by the insertion of a compensation clause. Whereas no compensation would remove the real evils of the measure, which we have attempted to explain.

Even supposing that Dr. Phillimore's principles could be carried fully out to their legitimate consequence, in the abolition of all private patronage (a *rasa tabula* being made of opposing vested interests) what would be the gain? The Crown and the bishops would then be the only patrons in the country. Is it probable that the livings would, on the whole, be then better filled than at present? It is not very difficult to answer this question, by looking at the actual holders of Crown and episcopal livings. Nay, if we could go farther still, and devise some Utopian scheme of patronage, expressly constructed for the reward of merit, it is very doubtful whether such a plan would not cause more evils than it cured; whether it might not foster hypocrisy as much as it might encourage virtue. The present system of patronage, though theoretically very imperfect, works well upon the whole. It secures, at any rate, two very important objects; first, the due influence of the laity in Church appointments*; and secondly, the fair representation of theological parties. The latter desideratum could scarcely be achieved

* At present two-thirds of the livings in England and Wales are in private patronage.

by any method of synodical or popular election, because, under such a constitution the preferment would be given exclusively to the adherents of the dominant party. At the same time, the actual condition of things produces, it must be owned, some scandals, and is blemished by some abuses. These might be removed, *quoad temporalia*, by legalising the sale of presentations without restriction; and *quoad spiritualia*, by making the preparation and examinations for holy orders more stringent than at present; by rendering the Diaconate (according to its true design) a kind of apprenticeship to the Ministry, and allowing deacons to withdraw from their profession if they found themselves unfitted for its duties; perhaps also by requiring that no incumbent should be instituted below the age of thirty; and possibly by permitting to the parishioners a veto on the presentation, under conditions such as those imposed by Lord Aberdeen's Act in Scotland. We rejoice in the parliamentary discussion of this very important subject of patronage, and hope that it may lead in time to some well considered measures of amendment, which will (we may venture to predict) be very different from that propounded by Dr. Phillimore.

There may be much difference of opinion upon many of the topics discussed in the preceding pages; but there is one point at least connected with the ecclesiastical revenues on which all must agree; namely, that Parliament has the power (whether it have the right or not) to apply these revenues to such purposes as it may judge most beneficial; and moreover, that it has exercised this power repeatedly in times past. This being the case, it may seem strange that there should be a possibility of its throwing away any part of this property, thus placed at its own disposal, from disliking the mode in which it is levied, or the purposes to which it is now applied. Yet this is not a mere possibility, but has already actually happened. By the Irish Tithe Commutation Act, for example, a quarter of the tithe was abandoned to the landowners, in order to conciliate their support. And this was only in accordance with the Irish Church Temporalities Act passed in 1833, by which church rates in Ireland were made no longer payable by the proprietors from whom they had formerly been due, but charged upon a fund formed by the suppression of ten supernumerary bishoprics. We do not deny that these measures were justified by strong motives of public policy; but we may venture to regret that it was not found possible to apply the property taken from the Church to other public purposes. For example, it was undoubtedly wise not to extort rates for Protestant churches from a Roman Catholic people; but one naturally is tempted to wish

that the same annual sum had been levied on the same property as a school rate. Had this been done, the large grant now annually voted for Irish education might have been spared.

In the late debate on English church rates, it was proposed by Mr. Hume to follow the Irish precedent, and charge the rates upon the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commission; and even Sir G. Grey is reported to have said that he saw nothing objectionable in such a scheme. The subject of Church Rates is too important to be treated at the end of an article; and we hope to return to it at an early opportunity. We will therefore content ourselves for the present with expressing our doubts of the soundness of a plan which would not merely absorb the whole of a revenue so recently devoted (by repeated Acts of Parliament) to other and far more important objects; but also would give an annual bonus of nearly half a million sterling to the owners of land and houses.*

It is doubly important at present to make this protest on behalf of the property of the public; because symptoms are not wanting of an unnatural coalition between Protectionist Toryism and Sectarian Democracy. Dissenters, who hate the Church more than they love the country, seem willing to gratify the unholy hunger of disappointed landlords hankering after the tithes. Several Protectionists in Parliament have spoken of the endowment of the Church as a burden on agriculture. And in this they have an imitator and ally in Mr. Allen, the Quaker, who has lately published a thick octavo against "State Churches," wherein he proposes that the nation should give up, if not the whole at least half the tithes, as a compensation to the agriculturists for the repeal of the corn-laws. Such a prospect is no doubt very alluring to the squire whose rent has been reduced; yet we trust that it is not very likely to be realised by Parliament. As to church rates, the irregularity of their recurrence, their semi-voluntary character, and other peculiarities, may perhaps blind the Legislature to the fact that in abolishing them it sacrifices a portion of its own rights over property. But the case of tithes is far more simple, and if Parliament should ever abandon them, it will do it with its eyes open. Few but those who are deeply interested or deeply ignorant will follow the Protectionist leaders in calling the property of the tithowner a burden on agriculture. It would be as reasonable to say that

* It is true that the legal incidence of church rates is theoretically *in personam*; but being, in the words of Lord Campbell (when Attorney General, in the House of Commons March 3. 1837), 'a charge on the person *in respect of the land*,' they are practically a charge on real property.

Lord Sefton's property in Lancashire was a burden on Lord Derby's property in the same county. For the titheowner and the landlord are in reality joint owners of the soil; nor has the landlord, nor any of his ancestors, ever possessed the titheowner's portion of the property. If the tithe be in arrear, the titheowner takes possession of the land, and retains it till the arrears be satisfied.* In many parishes the tithes have been commuted for land; and there it must be clear to the dullest farmer that the parson's estate in the parish is no burden upon his farming.

The term of *a burden upon agriculture* can only be correctly applied to that which prevents the agriculturist from bringing his produce into the market on equal terms with his competitors, or (in other words) which tends to throw the land out of cultivation. Now the farmer takes his land subject to the rights both of the landowner and of the titheowner; and the rent which he agrees to pay is the surplus remaining (after satisfying the claim of the titheowner) above the profit due to his own time and capital. Whenever the land yields such a surplus, the landlord of course will take it; and the extinction of tithe will make no difference to the farmer, who will pay the tithe to the landlord (as farmers of abbey-lands know full well) in the shape of an increased rent. But supposing the land to yield no rent, but only to produce enough to pay farmer's profit and tithe; still the tithe is no burden on the cultivation, though its existence, no doubt, diminishes the income of the landowner. Lastly, suppose the extreme case, when the land will not yield enough, after paying the titheowner, to remunerate the farmer; then, by the present law, the land becomes for the time the property of the titheowner, who will cultivate it for his own profit if its cultivation yields any profit at all. Consequently, there would be, even in this case, no tendency to throw the land out of cultivation, unless its cultivation would be impossible under any circumstances. There was, indeed, under the old law, a case in which tithe might have acted as a burden on agriculture. It sometimes happened that landowners were hindered from bringing waste land into cultivation, because it would not yield a profit after deducting a tenth of the produce, which was then due to the titheowner. But this impediment exists no longer; for no tithe-rentcharge is payable on any land which was not already in cultivation at the time of the passing of the Commutation Act.

While we are on this subject, we cannot help mentioning the original view put forward by Mr. Allen (the Quaker writer

before quoted) in defence of those who try to shake off this ecclesiastical burden. It has been often remarked that the owner of property is bound in justice to pay the tithes, because the purchase-money paid for his land was diminished by the value of the titheowner's interest in the soil. Mr. Allen replies that if the estate had been subject to the periodical incursions of a band of armed robbers, it would have sold for so much less in the market; but that its purchaser would not be therefore bound to submit to the depredations of the marauders. This answer shows a happy union of respect for law and perception of morality — '*Compositum jus fasque animo!*'*

The above remarks may perhaps suffice in reply to the Protectionist assailants of the Church. With regard to their democratic allies, who are so eager to destroy the Establishment that they wish to make the squires a present of its funds, it will probably occur to them, before the bargain is executed, that they may buy their whistle at a cheaper rate. They may take the tithe from the priest, and give it to the schoolmaster or the parish surgeon. Instead of pulling down the Church, they may turn it into a music hall or a mechanics' institute. However they may detest the 'superstitious uses' to which its revenues are now devoted, they are at liberty (saving vested interests) to apply them to more utilitarian purposes; and the application of them to any public purpose whatever would be better than their transfer to the owners of the soil. The fate of the Establishment amid the changes and chances of a government continually becoming more popular, is difficult to foresee. It may be maintained; it may be mutilated; or it may be demolished. But whatever be its destiny, we trust that it will be saved from that worst sacrilege, absorption in the maw of private selfishness. We trust that no future Parliament will rob the nation to enrich the landlords; nor fill the lap of luxury with the heritage of the poor.

* A clergyman of our acquaintance was formerly the owner of a house and garden which was subject to a rent-charge of 10*l.* per annum payable for the repair of the Quakers' meeting-house. We wonder whether Mr. Allen would apply his marauding theory to this instance.

ART. IV. — *First Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and report upon the System of superintending and executing Public Works, in the Madras Presidency.*
Submitted to the Right Honourable the Governor in Council of Fort St. George on the 23rd December, 1852. Madras : 1852.

IN January, 1850, the Court of Directors instructed the Government of Madras to appoint a commission for the purpose of inquiring into and reporting on the system under which Public Works are carried on in that Presidency. The Government of Madras carried that order into effect in February, 1851; and the first result has been this admirable Report, of which it is but faint praise to say that it is the most valuable work that has yet been printed at the Madras press. Its value consists in a clear exposition of facts and principles; and the conclusions to which it leads can scarcely fail to be for the most part acted on, and, when acted on, to produce a marked effect on the well-being of the people in the provinces subject to Madras.

In England, where so much is done by private enterprise, the term Public Works scarcely conveys that extensive meaning which attaches to it in countries in which the Government is the prime agent in all considerable undertakings; and besides the roads, canals, harbours, lighthouses, &c., which may be obviously suggested by it here, there is in Madras, as is well known, an extensive class of works, those of Irrigation, which are altogether the province of the Government. This arises from the fact that all the cultivated land of the country pays an assessment to the State, which, from its inequality, it is difficult to estimate correctly, but which may be roughly stated at from 30 to 40 per cent. of the gross produce. For purposes of assessment the land may be divided into two great classes; one of which, watered only by the rains, bears generally a crop of inferior value, and is subject to all the variations which occur in the quantity of rain that falls from year to year; while the other, being irrigated artificially, has a greater abundance and a less fluctuating supply of water, grows more valuable products, and yields a greatly larger return. The State alone, which receives so large a share of the gross produce, is in a position to undertake the formation, or attend to the repair, of the great works which distribute water over extensive tracts of country, or in fact of any work which cannot be executed by the inhabitants of a single village in a few days, and for

their own sole benefit. For the increased fertility conferred on the land by works of irrigation, the State receives a greatly enhanced assessment; but the cultivator finds also his due advantage in the greater value of the crop, and his comparative independence of the seasons.

In our climate, water is in excess, and draining is the chief instrument of artificial fertilisation. In India, water is in deficiency; irrigation is there the chief means of fertilising the land, and in some years the only means of rescuing it from entire barrenness. In England, the landowner is a private individual, and he generally defrays the chief cost of draining for the occupier. In India, the Government is the landlord; the occupiers of the soil are for the most part miserably poor; irrigation can only be conducted on a large scale; and therefore the expense of it, whenever it is adequately performed, must be defrayed by the Government.

The Madras territories lie between the eighth and twentieth degrees of north latitude. They are all, therefore, exposed to the burning sun of the tropics; but the two coasts have seasons in a great degree different from each other. Along the whole length of the western coast, there is a narrow slip of low land, scarcely exceeding forty miles in width, which is bounded on one side by the sea, and on the other by the great chain of mountains called the Western Ghats. In this narrow tract, and on the crest of the neighbouring mountains, the westerly periodical rains, which fall from June to October, never fail. Their influence extends, with diminished force and certainty, about half across the peninsula. But nature has made some compensation for their absence in the form of the land, for the whole watershed of the wide country from the Western Ghats to the Bay of Bengal is eastward, and the numerous rivers and smaller watercourses, many of them dry for months, which rise in the Western Ghats, or within the range of the westerly rains, bear annually to the Bay of Bengal vast volumes of water, with which the burnt-up plains of the Carnatic may be fertilised.

On the western coasts, 130 inches of rain are no uncommon fall, and on some exposed points as much as 400 inches has been known to fall within a year. But on the eastern coast, the average fall of rain is but 48 inches, and that with the greatest irregularity, nearly the whole being in six weeks of October and November. Five or ten inches sometimes fall in a day, so that, unless stored up, the greater part is useless for cultivation. But sometimes the rains fail altogether, and in such a season the want of artificial means of preserving the water makes itself felt. We have seen what are the effects of the destruction

of the potato crop in Ireland, of only one portion of the harvest, in a country intersected by roads, and nowhere a hundred miles distant from the sea. From that visitation it may be conceived what must be the sufferings of the people when there has not fallen rain enough to permit the seed to be sown,—when the earth is indeed of iron, and the heaven of brass,—when not a blade of corn springs up for the food of man, and not a blade of grass for the food of cattle. Such was the case in the Guntoor district in 1833. The periodical rains had failed generally on the Coromandel coast, and at Guntoor had failed entirely. In Tanjore, where artificial irrigation is on a large scale, the evil was comparatively little felt. But in Guntoor the blow fell with all its force. The area of the district is 4700 square miles, and it contained, in 1832, 512,000 inhabitants, of whom it is believed that no less than 200,000 died of starvation and of the fever which succeeded the famine. The conformation of the land in this district peculiarly suits it for irrigation, as the ground slopes down from an elevated centre, and the ruined works of former rulers attest the use to which this circumstance was once put. To prevent the recurrence of such a calamity as that which occurred in 1833, a work of irrigation was some time since ordered by the Court of Directors, which would ensure a permanent supply of water for a great extent of land. The estimated expense of this work is only 155,000*l.*, and it is calculated that it would yield an increase of revenue of not less than 73,000*l.* yearly, or 48 per cent. on the outlay; and we are told, ‘even the Government express their opinion that the ‘permanent annual gain to the revenue will not fall short of ‘30 per cent.’ This important work was long deferred on account of the want of engineers; but it has now for two years been vigorously prosecuted, and when once it is completed, the recurrence of such a visitation as that of 1833 becomes extremely improbable.

It is sufficiently evident from this simple instance how great is the value of such works, whether they are intended to store up the rain water in a tank, or to collect or distribute the supply which flows along the beds of rivers.

Their construction and repair is both a duty and a source of profit, and it was not neglected by the ancient rulers of the country. Excluding the western coast, the Madras territories contain eighteen districts, in all of which such works are required. In fourteen of those districts, omitting Tanjore, the best irrigated of all, the public accounts show that there are upwards of 43,000 works in repair, besides more than 10,000 out of repair, all of which were constructed before the English had

possession of the country. Many of these were formed with little engineering skill, many with a view to ostentation, or to perpetuate the name of the founder, rather than to a profitable return; but taken together they form an aggregate of property of the highest importance. The public revenue derived from them is no less than 1,350,000*l.* yearly, besides 150,000*l.* more, which have been alienated under the form of rent-free holdings, making a total of a million and a half sterling annually. The average yearly cost of their repairs for the last ten years has been 70,000*l.* Looking beyond the mere interest which the Government has in these works, and assuming the Government share to be two-fifths of the whole crop, the entire yearly produce must be estimated at three millions and three quarters sterling.

The works may be classed in two divisions, under the heads of channels and tanks. One class of channels depends on the low freshes of the rivers, to take advantage of which either a permanent stone drain is constructed, or a temporary one of earth is thrown up every year. The water is thus conveyed into a channel, sometimes fifty miles long, and is let out to the lands which require it by sluices in the banks. Another class of channels depends on the high floods, and obtains the water in a similar manner, and the supply being more precarious, conveys it to one or more tanks, where it remains stored up for use. A tank is constructed like any fish pond in England, by throwing an earthen embankment across a valley; but the size of these reservoirs is very usually such that it is necessary to protect the dam against the action of the waves by a revetment of rough stones. Some of these tanks are, indeed, worthy of the name of lakes, such as the Cauverypauk and Veeranum tanks, of which the embankments are respectively four and nine miles long, or the still greater Pounairy tank, in the Trichinopoly country, now out of repair, the dam of which is twenty-six miles long. These embankments are pierced by sluices of masonry, by means of which the water is let out below when required. There are usually one or more outlets, called Calingalas, constructed of masonry, near the end of the embankment, and formed as a precaution against sudden floods. For this purpose they are lower than the general level of the embankment, so that the superfluous water passes out through them, and when the season of supply is ending they are closed up. One or two rows of stone pillars are usually built into the masonry across the outlet to support the temporary dam thus constructed.

It will readily be understood that works of such extent and

magnitude must stand in need of frequent repairs. These may be either emergent, as when an embankment is breached, and must be repaired forthwith, in order to save the water and the produce of the year; or ordinary, which include all such as are requisite to meet the action of waves, running water, and sudden floods, in wearing away earth-work, or damaging stone-work,—repairs, in short, which are as much a necessity for the preservation of the permanent effectiveness of these constructions, as those of a carriage or steam engine. We have stated that 70,000*l.* has been the average yearly cost of the repairs, an amount which, if we assume, with the authors of this Report, that the original outlay on existing works was fifteen millions sterling, is only one half per cent. yearly on the first cost, while in England canals and works of that class require from three to four per cent. Any argument, however, which is thus brought forward, will depend for its conclusiveness on the correctness with which the original outlay was estimated, and this, it must be owned, is nothing more than a rough guess. We prefer an examination of facts which now exist to enable us to decide how far the repairs have been efficiently executed.

The public accounts of the year 1850, a favourable season, show that in the twelve chief irrigation districts there were under cultivation 1,787,909 acres. The same accounts state the land capable of irrigation to have been 2,682,260 acres, and that nearly 900,000 acres, or about a third of the whole, were not under cultivation, as, had the works been in proper order, they would, for the most part, have been. The accounts, however, though probably in most districts trustworthy, are admitted not to be altogether so; but whatever deductions may be made on this account, there will still remain a vast extent of land which is capable of irrigation by works now existing, but which, from their inefficient state, is not used.

The reports of the engineers who are in charge of the works throughout the country were laid before the Commissioners, and their testimony leads generally to the same conclusion. One states, ‘From all that I have learnt respecting works in this division, they are in all respects, both as to original construction and present condition, in a most imperfect state.’ Another reports, ‘The whole of the irrigation in the subdivision, with the exception of the two Amauny Talooks of Vizagapatam, have been almost entirely neglected, and stand in great need of repair.’ A third says, ‘The tanks and channels generally are not by any means in a state of good order; many sluices are out of repair, more are required; the same as to

‘ calingalahs (outlets). Land is certainly left uncultivated for want of such works, or from their being inefficient.’

Another, while stating that the works are generally in tolerable order, adds, ‘ A large number of tanks require their sluices to be renewed, &c.; and in almost every talook the revenue accounts exhibit a loss for want of proper means of irrigation.’

In another division, the engineer officer in charge of the works reports that they are in general good repair; but the Commissioners state that ‘ there is a large extent of land there, now uncultivated for many years, though once irrigated and productive;’ and add, ‘ that all the works of the country are below their state of full efficiency, and incapable of effecting their proper amount of irrigation. The tanks are in want of sluices, or such as they have are out of order; or they have no calingalahs, or such as they have are too small or too high, and so the stability of the tank is in danger; or the tank is low and weak, and the Ryots are afraid to store a full tank; or their channels of supply have become choked up, and no longer bring a full supply of water.’

The foregoing are extracts from official reports of a very late date. The following is from one written in December 1837, by an officer who had then been for nine years employed on works of irrigation:—

‘ I have not the least doubt that the expenditure has been totally inadequate. I judge, first from the innumerable instances of works in a defective state, which have come under my own observation. So generally, indeed, have I found the works in a defective state, that I believe I may say that nearly all the tanks in the country, and nearly all the channels also, excepting those of Tanjore, and the very large ones of other districts, water less land than they once did, many only one-fourth, and very great numbers from half to three quarters; and the actual revenue derived from several districts some years ago compared with the present, fully supports me in this opinion. By the statement above given, it appears that the Munjay (irrigation) revenue of North Arcot is 3 lacs (30,000*l.*) below what it was ten years ago, out of 15 lacs; in South Arcot 2 lacs out of 12; and in Tinnevely $\frac{3}{4}$ lac out of $11\frac{3}{4}$. But the falling off in the Munjay revenue has, I believe, been going on for a long series of years. . . . This question arises,—Is this deficiency owing to the deficient state of the public works, or to other causes? To this I can only reply, that from what I have seen, I have no doubt it is owing to that cause; and I believe that it will be generally allowed to be so by the revenue officers and engineers who have been employed in the irrigated districts.’

There can be no doubt that the works of irrigation are not generally in a good state of repair; but it is equally certain that

at the date when the last extract was written (1837), they were in a very much worse state than now. In 1838, a material change was made in the distribution of engineer officers; one so material, in fact, as to form an era in the history of the public works. The nature of this will be best explained by an account of its operation on the one district which, among those recently reported on, we have remarked as having its works declared to be generally in good repair by the engineer in charge of them. This is the district of Tinnevely, which up to 1834 was, with four other districts, the whole comprising an area of 38,460 square miles — altogether one-fifth larger than Ireland — the charge of a single engineer officer. From 1834 to 1838, this vast charge was slightly reduced to 32,880 square miles. But in 1838, the Tinnevely and Madura districts, forming an area of 16,400 square miles, were allotted as the charge of one officer; — an area greatly too extensive, — a charge infinitely too burdensome, but which still, as compared with what had previously existed, admitted of some control, and enabled the engineer to aim at a general supervision, which before was altogether hopeless. Bearing the data of these changes in mind, we find, in the following extract from the Report, that such improved superintendence, and the additional outlay which it renders possible, are not thrown away, even if considered merely as a commercial speculation:—

‘The aggregate income of the first nine years (1822-31), was 94.55.647 rupees, or 10.50.633 rupees annually; and the aggregate expenditure on repairs of the first ten years (1823-32) was 3.22.938 rupees, or 32.293 rupees annually. In the last fifteen years (1837-51) the aggregate income was 1.77.33.875, or 11.82.258 rupees annually; and the outlay on repairs was 807.826, or 53.855 rupees annually. The total excess of the expenditure in these fifteen years over what it would have been on the average of the first ten years, was 3.23.419 rupees; but the aggregate excess of revenue from irrigated land during the last fifteen years, over what it would have been at the average of the first nine, is 19.74.830 rupees.’

The greater part of the above outlay has been in repairs of old works, (not in the formation of new,) or in improvements extending irrigation to land which the imperfection of the old works did not permit to be irrigated, and in rendering tolerably certain the supply of water which before was fluctuating, and the very uncertainty of which was a cause of loss both to the cultivator and to the public revenue. The Tinnevely district is an instance of improvement by increased attention to many works scattered over the face of the country. As one

showing the contrast between neglect and attention in a narrower space, we may instance the northern portion of the delta of the Cauvery river, called the Talooks of Manargoody and Chillumbrum. Their irrigation had been much neglected, and the channels allowed to fill up, during the earlier years of our possession; but between 1834 and 1839 various repairs and improvements were executed. A dam was thrown across the river, the old channels cleared out, and new ones excavated, and the entire expense of these operations amounted to 35,900*l*. To the public revenue the result has been, that, comparing the average receipts of the eleven years preceding 1834, when the works were begun, with those of the fourteen years succeeding the construction of the dam in 1836, there is an annual gain of 11,500*l*., or an aggregate in the fourteen years of 161,113*l*.

These are instances of improvement on a large scale; but, while dwelling on these and on others which we have yet to mention, it is well to bear in mind that something more is involved in them than the interests of a government, the profitable investment of capital, or the triumphs of engineering skill. For this end we extract a passage from the Report, which is instructive as showing both the dependence of the prosperity of the people on the maintenance of these works, and the manner in which an imperfect system and an insufficient establishment may combine to prevent their restoration when in want of repair:—

‘In connexion with the subject of loss of revenue from neglect to repair works of irrigation, it must never be forgotten that for every hundred rupees of revenue so sacrificed, a further loss of fully one hundred and fifty is entailed on the ryot. Indeed, the loss to him is often total ruin, in cases which the Government only regard as a decline of revenue to the amount of a few hundred or a few thousand rupees out of their hundreds of lacs. For if the tank or channel on which the value of his land depends, is permitted to fall into decay, he has no resource; he cannot even, under the existing revenue arrangement, cultivate it with dry crops, for if he did so, he would have to pay the full rent for irrigated land; and the ground is therefore untilled. The following is an instance of this, and not a very rare one. The tank of the small village of Poottia-vauripilly in North Arcot, was breached in 1847 so as to be incapable of holding water. It was not repaired till 1851, the delay being chiefly in consequence of the civil engineer department having had no time to visit it, as the Board of Revenue would not sanction a talook estimate sent up. The ryots, who are poor hardworking people, deeply felt the loss of their tank, and did their best to get water from wells to cultivate a little of the land. The land thus cultivated has yielded 67 rupees a year, while the average collections prior to the breaching of the tank were 426 rupees. The

'estimate for the repair of the tank was only 750 rupees. Thus, in this petty case, the Government sustained a positive loss of above 1400 rupees in four years for want of a proper person to estimate for this trifling and simple work. But the loss to the ryots has been much more heavy; they have been reduced to much actual distress.' (*Report*, par. 277.)

The Commissioners proceed to observe, and we fully concur in the opinion, that when a cultivator has invested his capital and labour in land under a tank or channel, and has for a series of years depended upon it for subsistence, and paid the due revenue to Government, the repair of any injury which may happen to the work on which his maintenance is dependent, should not, unless in some extreme cases, be a new question of whether it will be a profitable investment of capital, but that he should be considered entitled, as by an implied contract, to have the necessary repairs executed.

The most striking effects of the extension of irrigation and of the application of engineering skill are undoubtedly to be found in the delta of the Godavery. In 1844 the revenue of that district was just what it had been forty years before, while in Tanjore, a district with no greater capabilities for irrigation, but with the benefit of the peculiar attention paid to it, and of an average yearly expenditure of about 8000*l*. (of which one half was for necessary repairs only, and not for improvements), the revenue rose in the same period by regular gradations from 310,000*l*. to 400,000*l*. In 1844 the revenue from the delta of the Godavery was declining, the people were impoverished and dispirited, when Colonel A. T. Cotton, who has illustrated his name by the great works he has since carried out, proposed a plan for throwing a dam across the river Godavery, and for distributing the water so accumulated by a network of channels over an area of 3000 square miles. At the place where the embankment was to be constructed, the river was two miles wide; it was divided by islands into four channels, and the bed was of sand of unknown depth. The works have since been carried on, as is usually the case, with insufficient means, and not much more than half of the calculated expenditure had taken place up to the end of the official year 1850-1, till which time the results are shown in a statement appended to the Report. These results are some of the most remarkable on record. About 130,000*l*. had been expended, and 110,000*l*. more was expected to complete the work. But, in fact, no real outlay had been made by the Government; for such had been the effect of the employment of capital and labour, and the stimulus given to an impoverished district, that, each year as the works went on,

even in the very first, the revenue rose, and was greater, after deducting the sum expended, than the average of the preceding eleven years. So that the total increase was more than 195,000*l.*; which, after deducting the outlay, left a clear profit of upwards of 65,000*l.*

These are magnificent results; and not many opportunities may be found for projects on so grand a scale, conferring such singular benefits in return for the application of capital. Yet, that it may not be supposed that this is a solitary instance, or that there do not yet exist, scattered through the plains of Southern India, localities which will yield to engineering skill rewards to encourage the most desponding, and satisfy the most greedy, it may be well to refer to a list of all the original works, so far as they could be ascertained, which have been at different times executed in the Madras Presidency from 1836 to 1849, and which is to be found in the Appendix to the Report. Thirty-nine works are enumerated in this catalogue, three of which have, from various circumstances, not been remunerative; the remaining thirty-six have afforded a profit on the money spent upon them, and this to such an extent that, taking the loss with the profit on the whole thirty-nine, not less than 69½ per cent. on the cost is repaid yearly. Thirteen of the thirty-six yield a profit of 134 per cent. on the outlay, and the remainder from 3½ to 47½ per cent. The entire sum laid out on these original works, has been only 54,100*l.*, the profit on which has been 37,670*l.* a year.

Enough has been said to show that the works of irrigation in the Madras Presidency are of the highest value; that they have not hitherto been kept in really efficient repair; that, if made fully efficient, they would justify the saying, that what is worth doing at all, is worth doing well; that both repairs and original works, if well selected,—in other words, if sufficient engineering skill is available,—are capable of producing results in return for the outlay of capital, such as are not dreamt of in more fully cultivated countries: and that the amount which has as yet been laid out, in original works especially, is paltry when compared with the extent of the Madras territories, 138,000 square miles. These advantages are altogether irrespective of the increased and less fluctuating supply of food, of employment for capital and labour, of the stimulus given to the exertions of the population, of the moral effects of plenty in facilitating their improvement.

Closely connected with the subject of works of irrigation, is that of internal communication. It is needless at this day to insist on the importance of roads, or to contrast the situation of

a country pierced with canals or railroads with that of one which has not even common metalled roads. But one point is worth observing, that in an inland country without roads, and where a heavy assessment is fixed on the land, it is possible that the construction of a great work of irrigation may be highly beneficial to the persons immediately affected by it, and may add greatly to their means of employing capital, while the great increase of food thus produced may, by there being no means of export, have even a deteriorating effect on the situation of some neighbours, whose fixed money assessment will, from the fall in the price of grain, bear a still greater proportion to the value of the gross produce of their land than it did before the work was constructed. Hence there may arise a necessity for reconsidering the Government assessment, and this, being a great deviation from official routine, may create, and we believe has created in some quarters, a strong feeling against all increase of works of irrigation, instead of producing, as might naturally be expected, a strong desire to apply the proper remedy of improved communications. It may be added that where there are no means of reaching the sea, and thus entering into the great market of the world, whatever is produced must be chiefly for local consumption, and from this cause the great staples, whether produced on irrigated land or not, of sugar, cotton, indigo, are altogether neglected for the production of food alone. The remedy for this, the obvious remedy, is a road, by means of which the grain may be exported; and a still more valuable advantage, by means of which the people may find it profitable, not exclusively to attend to the production of food, but to grow the far more costly products we have mentioned.

It is difficult to convey a correct idea of the state of the roads in the Madras country. They may be arranged in three classes, — those to which nothing whatever has been done, — those to which something has been done, — and those which are called trunk roads, and which are supposed to be on the footing of our turnpike roads. The first class forms the vastly greater portion of the whole. Any one who has seen a track across a common in Scotland, along which cattle are customarily driven, can conceive what these roads are. If the country is rough and stony, nothing but men and animals can pass along them; if smooth and even, carts are in use, unless hedges have been allowed to grow up so close on either hand as to prevent the passage of any thing wider than a loaded bullock. In either case, nature, and the traffic along the road, have made it what it is. The third class, the trunk roads, so far as they really exist, consist of a road from Madras due westward to the opposite sea coast; a

road from Madras to Trichinopoly; and one or two other roads; such as one from Coimbatore to the western coast. On the first, that from Madras to Bangalore, transit carriages, travelling six miles an hour, convey private travellers; although this is the most considerable line of passage for English travellers. Much even of it is unbridged. Of all these roads, however, there is not a mile, outside of the British stations, which is equal to a common turnpike road. As for the so-called northern trunk road, it has no real existence; 5,600*l.* have been spent on it in four years; pieces have been made here and there, but in a line seven hundred miles long, they are but few and far between. We described the second class of roads as those to which something has been done; but what has been done to them it is difficult to describe, from the variety in the nature of the roads, and the means applicable to improving them. Some lines on a good soil were impassable for want of bridges; others were throughout on a bad soil; others had difficult passes through chains of hills. A bridge or two in the first, and a well-traced line opened in the last, might make them greatly superior to what they were in their original state, and render them capable of permitting traffic to pass along them without difficulty; while nothing but a considerable outlay would form a passable road out of one labouring under the disadvantages of a bad soil throughout.

• The district of Tanjore has been fortunate in roads as well as in works of irrigation. During the last twenty years about 800*l.* a year has been spent on the roads by the Government, and about 1,500*l.* a year has been assigned to that purpose from the surplus of the pagoda funds which were managed by the Government. These sums have been laid out chiefly in building bridges, which, in a delta intersected by canals, are an absolute necessity. The connecting roads have been generally formed at the expense of the landholders, by heaping up earth two or three feet high so as to form a level causeway, and covering it with a layer of sand from the nearest canal. Of such roads there are 534 miles in an area of 4000 square miles, and, however rude and incapable of bearing a heavy traffic, they are of the highest value to the population.

The district of Salem has long been regarded as preeminent for the excellence of its roads. This originated about 1836, when an active collector, Mr. Orr, expended about 4000*l.* in putting the roads in repair; he further introduced a toll on carts, and, by means of the proceeds, and by the contribution of Government, the whole amounting to less than 1000*l.* a year, provided for the roads being kept up within his circle. In this case, the unpaid labour of the landholders was also largely made use

of; and the result at the present day is, that on the best soil for roads in Southern India, there are, in an area of 8000 square miles 400 miles of road, greatly superior to those which have had no care bestowed on them, and suitable to the generally light traffic which passes over them. It should also be added that no attempt has been made to connect this completely inland district with the sea, and to give its small system of roads an outlet to the nearest port. The effort in fact has been an isolated one, and has not formed any part of a system, notwithstanding that it long ago attracted attention, and that really to utilise its results, an outlet to the sea was essential.

The two districts we have mentioned are the most favourable instances to be found in the Madras territories; they are the best provided with roads; and the assessment on the land is comparatively light. It will not be uninteresting to consider the situation of two others which are not so advantageously circumstanced. We will take the two districts of Cuddapah and Bellary, both altogether inland, both with a rich soil, but labouring under a heavy assessment; both, however, having what may be considered an additional claim to some attention to their roads, in the circumstance that the high road from Madras to Bombay runs through them. In 1847 the collector of Cuddapah reported to Government that 'with the exception of a small portion of the road leading to Cumbum, the formation of which has lately been undertaken on an estimate of 186*l.* 14*s.*, 1867½ rupees, there is not a made road of any description throughout the whole length and breadth of this extensive province, in which so much trade and commerce are carried on, particularly in cotton, sugar, and indigo.' In 1851, however, there are more signs of animation. The Goolcherroo Ghaut, a difficult pass, has been completed, and 'nothing can possibly be better than the work; but until it can be approached on either side with somewhat less difficulty than at present, its value to the merchants must of necessity be comparatively small.' No doubt: and its value on the whole must be somewhat impaired by what we learn further, that, with that exception, 'nothing has been done to improve the communications in the past year;' and also, 'that roads, properly so called, can hardly be said to exist.'

The Cuddapah district, it should be observed, has an area of 12,970 square miles, and a population of 1,450,000 souls; and contains 3½ miles of made road. The neighbouring district of Bellary has been more fortunate. It contains upwards of 13,000 square miles, and up to 1847, had had an average expenditure of 158*l.* a year on its roads during the preceding

twenty years. It stands on the list as having nine miles of made road.

In 1850 the collector says in his annual report:—

“I have nothing further to add to my report dated the 22d October 1849, the orders of Government on which I am still expecting.” He refers to some repairs on a small part of the Belary and Dharwar road, on an estimate to the amount of rupees 6.177 13, as on the point of completion; and notices for the further estimate (for rupees 25.200) had not yet received the sanction of Government. He closes his short and hopeless report with a repetition of his request that some plan for making roads through Belary may be authorised and commenced upon. (*Report*, par. 346.)

The four districts we have noticed, show a marked difference in the treatment they have received at the hands of the British Government. In the first two, some attention has been directed towards creating a system of passable cross roads, though, in the main lines which are in India called trunk roads, they are nearly wholly deficient. In the last two, on the contrary, so little has been done, that it may fairly be said that no attention whatever has been given to the improvement of the roads. So striking a difference would lead to the belief that there has never been any systematic endeavour to improve the roads of the country, and that this great engine for the advancement of commerce has been altogether neglected. The conclusion, however, would not be substantially right, inasmuch as it would not do justice to the good intentions which caused the establishment of a superintendent of roads, and placed all the chief communications of the country under his care, with a fixed yearly fund at his disposal.

A slight sketch of the subject will show that the complete apathy with which the improvement of the roads was originally regarded has gradually changed for a generally earnest desire on the part of the Government to effect that object while the extracts from official documents which have already been given, show that the same wish pervades the great body of the local officers. The difficulties in the way of progressive improvement have been those which arise not only from disinclination, but from the want of money, of proper establishments, and of that wide and systematic view of the whole subject, which could alone clear away such obstacles, but which no one has ever had time to take, and which is now, for the first time, partially supplied by the present Report.

In 1817, the Court of Directors ordered that the ferry funds, a small branch of revenue arising from the leasing out of ferries, and not amounting to more than 3500*l.* a year,

should be assigned to the improvement of the roads. Subsequently but many years ago, this was done in the north of India, where a local committee in each district manages the revenue from ferries. But the Government of Madras of that day did not even take the trouble to carry out this order, and it has never been acted on. From 1817 to 1835, the chief improvement made in the roads was by means of the military corps of Pioneers; and this, though but a small body of men, did much good service, more especially in opening passes through the chains of mountains by which the Peninsula is intersected. These passes were, it is true, often too steep for wheels, or nearly so; but, such as they were, they were infinitely superior to the old tracks, and were fit for the passage of loaded pack bullocks, which before had either to be lightly loaded, or to have their burdens carried on men's heads through the pass. In one instance, a large sum was spent on a road made by the combined labour of the pioneers and common workmen, — so large, and with such unsatisfactory results, that the Government resolved in 1831 to make no more lines of road. From 1836 to 1842, Lord Elphinstone was Governor of Madras; and, among several beneficial measures to which his attention to this branch of his Government led, one may be cited which has become of permanent advantage to the country. This was the formation of the Western Trunk Road, leading from Madras towards Bangalore, on which a great traffic is now carried on, the heaviest, probably, on any road in India. Lord Tweeddale succeeded as Governor in 1842, and the result of the attention which he paid to the subject was the appointment of an engineer officer as superintendent of the department of roads, and the assignment by the Court of Directors of a fund of 40,000*l.* a year to be expended by it. The Court directed that the outlay on trunk roads should not exceed that sum, but observed that the fund was applicable only to trunk roads, and that other roads must be separately provided for. For this purpose, it was ordered that each collector and civil engineer should report every year on the state of the cross roads of his district, and the collectors were authorised to lay out on them fifty rupees a mile, in cases where the civil engineer concurred as to the propriety of the outlay. The latter clause was never acted on. No such authority was given to the collectors, and though their reports have been yearly made, and it has become known through them that there are great inland districts whose crying want is the improvement of their roads, that want has been wholly neglected. The inconvenience of a frequent change of governors is most clearly exhibited, when, as in the

present instance, the favourite plan of one person has to be carried out by his successor. This remark especially applies to what ultimately befell the department of roads. The superintendent, an able and energetic officer, submitted to the Government a statement of the establishment necessary for carrying out the purposes for which his office had been created. The establishment which he proposed was refused, and the new office rendered of no avail: so that after it had existed six years, of the 240,000*l.* which had been assigned to it in that period, only 130,000*l.* had been expended.

Like its predecessor of 1817, the Madras Government of 1842 did not carry out the orders of the Home Government, which assigned a certain fund for the improvement of the roads. Whether from not valuing the object, or from a desire to gain credit for economy, or merely from being too feeble to be capable of breathing energy into so great a work, the fact is certain, that nearly half of the road fund remained unspent, and that the road department was kept in so inefficient a state that one-third of that expenditure nominally made on the roads under its charge, was really laid out on works executed not under its superintendence, but under that of the ordinary district officers.

The disinclination to expend money on roads, thus strongly manifested in not even permitting the expenditure of the amount ordered by higher authority to be laid out upon them, was assuredly not caused by the want of success which had attended the one road already completed, or by the results of a comparison of the money laid out on it, and of the benefits that outlay has produced. The road we allude to is the Western road to Madras. In 1851 it had been, if not completed, at least opened, so as to be fit for traffic, though not bridged throughout, as far as the limits of Mysore, where it joined a road constructed by the Government of that country, and leading to Bangalore. The benefits which have been conferred on commerce by the construction of this road may be inferred from a statement furnished to the Commissioners by a merchant resident at Madras, and extracted from his correspondence with his constituent at Wallajahnuggur, a commercial town inland. Two of the items given will be sufficient for our purpose. In 1837, before the road was commenced, the hire of a cart carrying 900*lbs.* between the two places was 10*s.* (5 rupees). In 1851, the improvement of the road enabled the same cart to carry 1600*lbs.*, and its hire was 7*s.* 3*d.* (3 rupees 10 annas). The cost of the carriage of goods was therefore reduced in 1851 to considerably less than half what it was in 1835; an advantage which, no doubt, was chiefly felt by the

public, but which, as the road is an important military line of communication, and public stores, &c., to a considerable extent pass along it, must have produced a large and calculable saving in the expenditure of Government.

Independent, however, of this source of direct saving, and of the share in the general improvement which must have accrued to the Government, there is, under the system of taxation existing in that country, a branch of revenue which, judging from the results of the construction of this road, seems to promise the reimbursement of much of the money that may hereafter be laid out upon roads from seaports to inland districts. Salt, it is well-known, is a monopoly of Government. Where roads are unimproved, it finds its way laboriously on the backs of bullocks, or on lightly laden carts, into the interior. Its price, raised by the difficulties in the transit, imposes a check on the amount consumed. From Madras itself no salt was exported inland before the construction of the road in question. What went from that part of the coast was exported from the neighbouring district of Chingleput. A comparison of the value of the salt sold on account of Government in different years shows that a vast increase has taken place, the far greater part of which can be attributed to no cause except the opening of the road; for inasmuch as when, by way of compensation for the abolition of the transit duties in 1843, an addition of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was made to the price of salt, a sudden falling off everywhere occurred in the sales of salt, the subsequent increase of salt revenue in this locality must be attributed only to the effects of the road. Of this increase, it must be observed that not less than 80 per cent. is a clear profit. In 1841, there was sold in the two districts of Madras and Chingleput, salt to the amount of 48,140*l.*, and in 1850, the quantity sold had gradually risen to the value of 74,980*l.* The whole original cost of the road, and the subsequent repairs, had been 142,300*l.*, but the average annual gain in the increased sales of salt had been between the two years specified, above 14,226*l.*, a gross return from salt alone of nearly 10 per cent. on the outlay.

Works of irrigation and roads offer the most extensive and important as well as the most obvious means of improving the productive powers of the country, and the condition of the people, at the same time that the money laid out upon them may be expected to yield a fair remuneration even in a mercantile point of view. If they have been neglected, or but slightly attended to, it is not surprising that a similar and greater neglect has been shown towards the creation of internal navigation by canals, or to the preservation and improvement

of harbours. On both coasts of the Peninsula, but more especially on the western, there are backwaters or lagoons at the embouchure of rivers, which extend inland to a considerable distance, and are valuable as means of communication with the coast. In some instances, there are facilities for joining these waters by canals and cuts, and thus creating a lengthened internal navigation. The following extract, which refers to some improvements in the back waters of Malabar, will perhaps sufficiently explain both the nature of such works, and the manner in which their utility may be regarded :—

‘ The cuts were three in number, to the aggregate length of twenty-one miles, and at a total cost of 29,904 rupees (2,990*l.*). Though their whole length is so little, yet with the intervening backwaters they form a connected navigation ninety miles in length. These works were sanctioned during Lord Tweeddale’s government, and besides greatly promoting trade and intercourse in general, they are of great importance to the district in facilitating the transport of grain from the southern talooks to those in the north, the staple of which latter is pepper. The canals are very narrow, and sufficient only for the small boats in use, but it will, no doubt, be most advisable to improve them eventually for steam navigation. It was a part of the original design to unite in one continued navigation the backwaters of Malabar, Cochin, and Travancore, from Baragherry to Quilon, a distance of above 200 miles; and the project for this purpose was sent in by the Board of Revenue for the approval of the present Government. It consisted of the cutting of a canal and the improvement of a backwater, for a distance of fifteen miles, involving an expense of 8,995 rupees (900*l.*); but the Right Honourable the Governor in Council saw “no sufficient reason for incurring the expense.” He was also “of opinion that the time and attention of the civil engineer should not be called off from more important works by projects of this character.”

Harbours have, naturally had little care taken of them, especially as the machinery for doing so has been in a great measure wanting. Of the fifty-seven places at which port-dues are levied in the Madras Presidency, there is one, the port of Coringa, which deserves special notice. It is, after Madras, the most important, and is, more than Madras, capable of improvement at a moderate cost. Its situation at the mouth of the great river Godavery is a favourable one; and had it happened in earlier days that the seat of government had been fixed on this spot, and that our territories had extended inland from this place, instead of over the extreme south, the Southern Presidency would probably, ere now, have emulated Calcutta in the extent and value of its commerce. For 700 miles the Godavery and the Wurdah penetrate inland to the rich cotton

districts of Berar. The river has been navigated in former days, for a great part of that distance, by the boats of a European firm now no longer existing; but the navigation is not now carried on, though it is understood that there are but five or six obstacles, and those easily removable. There is, however, an additional hindrance in the shape of vexatious transit duties levied by the native chiefs through whose lands the river runs.

The physical obstacles will, it may be hoped, before long cease to exist, as a project has been set on foot for the purpose, and it is probable that negotiation will effect the removal of the artificial hindrance of the transit duties. The British Government has now an additional interest in improving the navigation of these noble streams, as the newly assigned districts of Berar, received from the Nizam, communicate directly with them. The cotton districts of Berar furnish about sixty million pounds of cotton annually to the Bombay market. The cotton is conveyed on pack-bullocks, and the various marts, at which it is purchased, are from 216 to 450 miles from Bombay. During that long transit it is exposed to numberless causes of loss and injury. The cost of transport from the nearest mart was stated, by a Committee which sat at Bombay in 1847, at 66 per cent. of the prime cost. Fifty out of that sixty-six will, it is calculated, be saved, if the attempt to open the navigation of the Godavery and the Wurdah is successful, or, to state the result in money, the cotton, which, on its arrival at Bombay, now costs 166*l.*, will be delivered at another port, that of Coringa, for 116*l.* or 117*l.* Here would be a ready solution of the problem which has engaged so much attention, the mode of increasing the quantity of cotton imported into England, and it is almost superfluous to point out that a stimulus would be applied, not only to the production of that one article, but to every branch of trade which so great an extent of rich country is capable of maintaining.

Enough has been said of the public works of the Madras territories to show that that country possesses capabilities for improvement to an extent which, in a country that has been inhabited for centuries, is as remarkable as those of the Western States of North America. An annual return of nearly 70 per cent. has been yielded by the aggregate of new works of irrigation constructed by the British Government. Even a new road has been productive as a mere investment of capital. By the side of this result, it is not a little remarkable that those districts which have not profited by the recent outlay on public works have been, as nearly as may be, stationary during the last thirty years. They declined until 1838, when a commis-

sion was appointed to inquire into the causes of the general falling off of revenue at Madras. They have again in some degree advanced since that period; and the abolition of the transit duties in 1843 had a marked effect in reducing the annual arrears of land revenue. Throughout the agricultural districts the rate of interest may be stated at not less than 12 per cent.,—a rate which indicates how high must be the usual profit on capital properly employed. The wages of labour are extremely low, and there is a vast area of uncultivated land, equal in extent to what is now cultivated, and which is capable of being profitably occupied. The Courts of Law may be doubtless susceptible of improvement, but insecurity of property is not one of the causes which can be assigned in answer to the question which the facts we have stated suggest, Why private capital is not largely employed in so large and profitable a field? The cultivators of the South of India are generally an industrious race, and energetic compared with the peasant of Bengal, in which country so great an extent of land has within the last sixty years been rescued from the domain of the tiger and the buffalo. The obstacle, therefore, lies not in the personal deficiencies of the cultivator, but in the circumstances in which he is placed. He pays from 30 to 40 per cent. of the gross produce as land revenue to Government, and, in addition to this, his normal condition is to be in debt. A bad season, or the religious duty of marrying his children, and the social one of spending on the ceremony much more than he can afford, lays the foundation of the debt, and he finds its extinction a much less easy process. He cultivates as much land as he can conveniently occupy, but he would readily cultivate more if he could get it for nothing, and thus gain an increased proportion of the produce of the whole for himself. But, under the present system, for every additional acre he must pay the due assessment. There is nothing in his circumstances to excite him to extra exertion, or to increased cultivation, unless some new road or work of irrigation confers an additional value on his share of the crop.

There is therefore a general tendency to a stationary condition, which is the direct effect of the Ryotwar system. This system, divested of all adventitious practices and rules, which may vary materially in different places, has for its fundamental principle that each cultivator shall pay the land revenue assessed on the land which he occupies, and nothing more, and that he shall pay it direct to the Government. As regards the lands in actual cultivation, the system may be considered perfect in theory. He has the power of diminishing or increasing his

farms, is not subject to any superior, and is called on to pay no extra cesses. The collector of the district superintends the land revenue; and the cultivator has every year an opportunity of meeting him in person, and of making known to him his wants or his grievances, whether as an individual, or in company with his fellow-villagers. In practice, however, the system breaks down, first, from the immense size of some of the districts,—of that of Bellary, for instance, which contains more than 13,000 square miles, and 1,200,000 souls, in which the collector is expected to perform duties too extensive for one man. This is a fault which can be and ought to be removed. A still greater practical defect in the present arrangements is, that in no part of the Madras territories has a survey and assessment been executed. The consequence is, that the present assessment is not only extremely unequal, but that its amount is often a standing reproach. No better instance of its inequality can be adduced than that in Tanjore, which has an almost unfailing supply of water for irrigation, tolerably good roads, and the sea close at hand for exporting produce, an acre of rice land pays $4\frac{3}{4}$ rupees of land revenue; while in Cuddapah, far inland, and with no made road whatever, the same extent of land averages $8\frac{1}{2}$ rupees. The excessive amount occasionally charged on land may be exemplified by the fact that there are great plains in the Bellary country consisting of first-class land, which are lying waste in consequence of the assessment being more than proportionately high upon land of that class, and second-class land being therefore preferred. In like manner, in the sub-collectorate of Salem, a large quantity of the best land is out of cultivation for the same reason.

Two measures, the diminution of overgrown collectorates, and the execution of a general survey and assessment, would remove the chief practical difficulties which encumber the operation of the Ryotwar system, as regards lands actually in cultivation. But there yet remains to be mentioned one fundamental defect of that system, as it affects land which is not in cultivation. The cultivable waste land has remained unoccupied from year to year, and appears likely to continue so for an indefinite length of time. It yields, and is likely to yield, neither crop to the husbandman nor revenue to the Government; and it would be no loss to the latter, if, content with the existing land revenue, it made a present to the cultivator of this dormant fund, and allowed him to use it without additional payment. It is by an arrangement of this description that cultivation has so much advanced in the Presidencies of Bengal and Agra. A fixed amount of revenue has been there assessed, whether in

perpetuity or for a term of years; and whatever fresh land can be brought into cultivation is so much clear gain to the person or community with whom the settlement has been made. The resources from which the assessment is to be paid are increased by every additional acre, whether by the simple receipt of more rent, in the case of an individual; or, in that of a community, by spreading the whole over a wider surface, and lightening the share of each individual. There is thus always residing on the spot a direct interest to clear and break up, and let out waste land for cultivation. It is by such a process that the great increase of the revenues of Bengal since 1792 has been caused,—an increase which has shown itself, not in that portion which is derived from land, but in all the other subordinate branches of the public income. In Madras, on the contrary, every acre of newly occupied land pays eventually the same assessment as the old farms; and no increase of cultivation lightens the burdens on the neighbouring lands. No one, therefore, is interested in increasing the cultivation, and no man's payment is lessened by it.

There is one concomitant of the Ryotwar system which, perhaps more than any other, has unconsciously biassed in its favour the officers who have directed its operations; this is, that the cultivator, whether rich or poor, when once he has paid his assessment, is comparatively independent of all the world: whereas, under the native system which preceded it, he was subject to numberless oppressions and exactions; and something of this nature may probably, in some degree, exist wherever a middleman is interposed, and where the poorer cultivators are not placed in direct communication with the British revenue officers. It is not improbable but that some method may be found of conciliating these two great interests,—the social independence of the cultivator, and the means of using that large extent of fertile land which has for so many years lain waste and useless. In order to effect this, to consider the principles on which a survey should be conducted, and the objects to which it should be directed, and to dispose of the many important questions concerning land which would arise in the course of such an inquiry, it is essential that a Commission should be appointed; and it will form an era in the internal history of Madras, if its labours should produce as marked an effect on the various interests connected with the land, as the Report on Public Works is likely eventually to do on the whole of that department.

The question which, for the improvement of the country, is the greatest and most extensive in all its bearings, is that of

land revenue, and a proper adjustment of it would of itself give a general stimulus to cultivation. Next in consequence, and auxiliary to it, is the organisation of the department of Public Works, whose importance has hitherto been so little recognised that there is no authority whose separate and special task it is to superintend them. The persons who execute works are generally the same. But for superintendence, the military works and buildings are under one authority; the judicial, such as gaols, under another; some of the trunk roads under a third, and the remainder of the roads, and the whole of the works of irrigation, under a fourth. This last is the Board of Revenue, already fully employed by the important and pressing business from which it takes its name. It has, in fact, been unable to serve two masters; and the Public Works, which ought to receive undivided attention, have been the least important part of its charge. With an inadequate office establishment, meagrely increased to meet the increased demands upon it caused by the correspondence being in 1850 nine times as great, and the expenditure nearly double what it was in 1836, it was scarcely possible that the business should be carried on in the way such important interests demand. The current work has been kept under, but there has been no time for a general view of things, no careful collection of statistics, no comparison of the present with the former state of works, of the wants of the works of one district, or of the operations of one engineer with those of another, no statement of the result of works from which inferences affecting future operations should be drawn, no general plan of roads, while several fundamental questions, such as what class of road should be constructed for different amounts of traffic, have not been settled. The obvious and effectual remedy for this state of things is that recommended by the Commissioners—to establish a Board of Works, and to place under their management, guided by a well-considered system of rules, the whole of the buildings and works of irrigation, the canals, roads, and harbours of the country. Such a Board will give its undivided attention to the great interests committed to its charge, and will have it in its power to remedy all the defects we have pointed out. It will, moreover, be governed by system instead of by accidents,—by a system of forethought and supervision, in place of one regulated by the accidental activity of a collector or an engineer, or whatever the circumstances may be, which have led to the somewhat discreditable inequality which now exists, in the neglect of the roads of one district and the attention paid to those of another.

It will, moreover, not be sufficient merely to remodel the chief authority. The *personnel* of the department requires to

be improved. How much this is wanted a few words will explain. The area of the Madras territory is upwards of 138,000 square miles. There are twenty collectorates, of which fourteen may be termed irrigation districts. The collectorates vary in size from 13,000 to 3000 square miles. They are subdivided into *talooks*, of which there are altogether 256, and which average more than 500 square miles. Over each talook is placed an officer called a *tehsildar*, who is subordinate to the collector, and carries on the revenue and police duties of his circle. He has also the charge of all public works which are not for military purposes. Under his authority emergent repairs are executed, while, for ordinary repairs of works of moderate importance, he frames estimates, forwards them to the collector, and executes them when orders have been received. His chief instrument in framing such estimates is a subordinate native officer called a *Maistry*. There is one of these officers on an average in every two and a half talooks, whose range may comprise a thousand works of all sorts, besides several hundreds of miles of roads. It is his business to be acquainted with all these works, to visit them successively, especially those which are reported as requiring repair, to frame estimates, and, on works of a certain magnitude, to superintend their execution. To fit the *Maistry* for these duties there is no place of instruction open to him, nor is any care taken that a class of such importance should be specially educated. The consequence is not only that useless men are retained in such situations, because no better substitutes are to be found, but that they are declared to be generally incompetent, and 'no better than common bricklayers,' whereas, if properly qualified, the *Maistry* would be most useful, both from the work he would himself perform, and from the check he would be on the *tehsildar* and his subordinates.

For superintending the execution of works of considerable magnitude, it is usual to appoint an European overseer, drawn from the ranks of the British regiments, or a commissioned officer. The overseer, when so appointed, belongs to the department, and his services have been found invaluable, but neither for him is there any mode of obtaining such scientific and practical instruction as would double their value.

The civil engineer (an officer of the military Corps of Engineers) has properly no concern in the execution of work. His duties are to visit in person every part of his circle, to report to the collector the general state of works, to examine and estimate for those of considerable magnitude which are in want of repair, to project new works, to examine work which has been executed, and to check and test the expenditure. He has an office establishment, for the members of which also, with one exception,

no instruction is provided*, and the exception is but an insignificant one in favour of the class of assistant surveyors, usually East Indians, of whom five or six are to a certain extent taught in a room of the Board of Revenue office at Madras. The circle of a civil engineer, the tract of country which he has to visit in person, comprises two collectorates, and when it is stated that some of these circles comprise 24,000, 20,900, and 16,000 square miles, enough has been said to show that it is impossible for one man to execute the duties of his office efficiently. Some of the reforms called for in regard to the *personnel* of the department of Public Works are therefore sufficiently obvious; to place an engineer in each collectorate, and to provide an educational establishment for the special instruction of the three classes of subordinate officers to whom such important duties are intrusted. These measures would increase the expense of the permanent establishments, but it can scarcely be doubted that the power of doing work well instead of slurring it over, or altogether neglecting it, as is now necessarily done by the engineers, and the improved capacity for intelligent supervision and execution which would be created in the subordinate officers, would amply repay the mere money outlay, while it would make the difference to parts of the country which suffer under the present system, of their works of irrigation being perfected, and such roads as may

* There is one other place of instruction from which it strikes us that a very useful class of subordinate officers, supplemental to the Corps of Engineers, may eventually be drawn; we allude to the school recently established by Major Maitland in the Gun-carriage Manufactory at Madras, of which he is superintendent. The pupils are the apprentices of the Corps of Artificers, and are for the most part, if not exclusively, East Indians.

This is a class which is generally held very cheap in India; and a notion is prevalent, that with here and there an individual exception, to look to its members for any considerable amount of either physical or intellectual service is utterly vain. Major Maitland's experiment, which has been carried out mainly at his own private expense, and entirely by his own disinterested zeal, has gone far to prove that there is neither bodily nor mental incapacity inherent in the East Indian race; that the defects usually found in them are the results of languid and effeminate bringing up; and that a vigorous and hardy training such as he gives them, regular in system, strict in discipline, and combining practical handicraft with theoretical science and general knowledge, can make out of this despised material an active, intelligent, and well-informed class of public servants. Major Maitland's school has, we believe, already supplied efficient assistant engineers to the Madras Railway Company. If properly organised as a public institution, we see no reason why it should not do the same for Government.

be formed being properly and expeditiously executed. We find in the Report several instances of considerable saving having been effected by the presence of European overseers in supervising work, and there seems no room to doubt that had those men, and all the other subordinate officers employed in the department, received a more complete course of instruction, the result would have been a general economising of the expenditure.

There is yet one subject of considerable importance to be adverted to, which concerns not only the Government of Madras, but also the two authorities to which it is subordinate. The presidency of Madras, under the financial arrangements which now prevail, is expected to pay its own expenses, and to contribute 500,000*l.* towards the home remittance. It is therefore of importance to know what its expenses are. The heaviest item is the military. The Madras army garrisons the territories properly belonging to Madras. It also occupies Mysore, whose Government by treaty pays to that of Madras a fixed sum which meets the expenditure; and the Nizam's country, in payment of which a sufficient territory was long ago ceded by that prince. But in addition to these services, for which the Madras treasury is reimbursed, there are others for which it receives no payment. The Southern Mahratta country, whose revenues belong to Bombay, the Saugur and Nerbudda territories, Cuttack and Nagpore, Tenasserim, and now Pegu, whose revenues or payments go to Bengal or Agra, are all occupied by Madras troops; and a considerable expense on account of Aden also falls on Madras. In calculating the proper expenses of that presidency, those incurred on account of countries foreign to it ought to be deducted, and, in their place, a due share, if any such is due, of the expenses incurred on account of the general defence of our Indian empire, should be imposed.

It is also of consequence that a correct financial view should be taken of the annual expenditure on account of repairs of works of irrigation. These repairs are now incorrectly assumed to be expended out of the net revenue. They are in fact necessary conditions for the production of any permanent revenue from irrigated lands, and should be deducted from the gross land revenue, the net land revenue being that which remains after deducting them. They are similar in nature to the repairs of a steam engine or of a dwelling house; and no house proprietor would be considered in his proper senses if he calculated his income from a house he had let to be the gross receipts, and did not make an allowance for common periodical repairs. They resemble the expenses of the repair of farm buildings on an English estate, which form a deduction from the gross income.

What is desirable under an efficient Board of Works is to place every existing work of irrigation in the best repair, as being the plan which is at once the most economical and efficient. The experience of a few years will establish the percentage of casualties and common repairs which are yearly required, and a fixed sum, revisable from time to time, should be annually allowed for the purpose as a deduction from the gross land revenue. An additional sum should be fixed as the yearly expenditure on new works, and anything beyond this should be the subject of a special application to the Government of India. This is a question of detail, but it is not unimportant. The present system of requiring a separate application from the subordinate governments for permission from the Government of India to undertake any work which is to cost 1000*l.*, is open to serious objection. It causes disgusts and heart-burnings, whether from its being felt to be a continual reminder of want of confidence, or from an unreasonable desire of not being subjected to any superior so near at hand, or from the occasional refusals which are met with. As regards Madras, indeed, such refusals have been very limited in number; the whole during the last ten years being 8 in 134 proposals, or just 6 per cent.

The object to be borne in mind in devising arrangements of this nature is, to combine the requisite control on the one hand with the greatest practicable liberty of action in the party controlled. Between the Board of Works and its own government, and between the subordinate and superior governments, the same system should prevail, of sending a yearly estimate describing, in anticipation, the plans to be carried out in the ensuing year, and a yearly report stating what had been executed in accordance with the estimate previously sent, and with the orders passed upon it. Under such a system there will be a sufficient power of check and control, and, in comparison with the present, there will be more free action. Under such a system it would have been equally impossible to have neglected to assign the ferry funds for the repair of roads, or to take proper steps towards expending the fund which the Court of Directors lately allotted to the road department.

In the course of our remarks we have indicated how wide is the field for internal improvement in Southern India. It is with reference to the possibility of such improvements being attempted that we look upon it as nothing short of essential that whoever is selected as Governor of Madras should be versed in the details of Indian administration, and be also capable of statesmanlike views, and that on that or some other field of action he shall have shown himself to be equal to the duties which rightly belong to that important office. Above all things

he should not be a mere name. The Madras Government, in the person of its European revenue officers, is brought every year into direct contact with every member of the agricultural class, and how numerous a body that is may be inferred from the fact that in Tanjore alone they are 140,000. This extensive ramification of its agency enables it to influence for good or for evil the fate of vast bodies of peaceable and industrious men. On the correct solution of some of the vital questions which we have indicated depends the manner in which the most important matters affecting their prosperity and advancement shall be regulated, and it is not therefore too much to say that there are few men to whom it is given to have such power of benefiting his fellow creatures as is intrusted to a Governor of Madras.*

* The subjoined statement exhibits the revenue derived from miscellaneous sources, exclusive of land, in the Bengal Presidency in 1792-3 and in 1850-1. The more recent acquisitions of that Presidency have been omitted from both columns. Since 1792-3 the events principally affecting these branches of revenue have been the imposition of stamp duties, the abolition of internal transit duties, and the increase of the consumption of opium in China. The gross revenue from these sources, in round numbers, has risen in the interval from a million sterling to five millions; the net revenue from 800,000*l.* to 3½ millions. A certain influence in producing this result is unquestionably due to each of the changes which we have mentioned, more especially to the increased demand for opium; but these events could only supply favourable circumstances, and the elasticity and power to take advantage of them is due to the limitation of the land revenue. This circumstance is altogether wanting in Madras, and it will accordingly be found that no corresponding increase has taken place there.

	GROSS RECEIPTS.					
	1792-3.			1850-1.		
Stamps - - -	-	-	-	20.51.673	9	9
Abkaree - - -	2.16.214	6	3	28.62.405	6	2
Sayer - - -	1.94.671	6	3	4.15.810	2	9
Customs - - -	7.27.056	11	9	1.01.36.389	15	8
Salt - - -	72.02.769	0	0	97.49.559	0	0
Opium - - -	25.92.940	0	0	2.59.71.000	0	0
Total Co.'s rupees -	1.09.33.651	8	3	5.12.36.888	2	4
Charges - - -	28.14.988	10	4	1.59.50.447	6	1
Net Receipts - -	81.18.662	3	11	3.52.76.390	12	3

ART. V. -- 1. *A Bill for the Promotion of Education in Cities and Boroughs in England, prepared and brought in by Lord John Russell and Mr. Secretary-at-War.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 7th April, 1853.

2. *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, 1852-3.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. London: 1853.

3. *A Bill intituled 'An Act for the better Administration of Charitable Trusts.'* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. 1st July, 1853.

4. *Report and Evidence upon the Recommendations of Her Majesty's Commissioners for Inquiring into the State of the University of Oxford.* Presented to the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors, December 1. 1853. Oxford: at the University Press. 1853.

THE urgent necessities of public business made it impossible for Parliament to consider last Session the Government Education Bill, which we have placed first in our list at the head of this Article. This delay need not, however, be regretted, if, as we trust, will be the case, the measure be in consequence made more comprehensive, and if, by the time thus given for consideration, the public becomes more fully awake to the existence of evils which cry aloud for a remedy, and to the absolute necessity for meeting these evils in a practical way in spite of all difficulties.

Of course reasonable objections may be made to the system of an education-rate as embodied in this Bill, and to the necessary compromise as to full religious instruction which a rate seems to entail; but, what every man who loves his country is at this time bound to consider, is, not what objections can be raised to the scheme proposed, but whether, amidst the many objections to which every scheme is liable, the scheme now brought forward be liable to the fewest, and whether the overwhelming weight of objections does not lie against proposing no general measure at all. To our minds the case as to the education of the poor presents only these three alternatives: either, 1st, no general measure of education for them at all; or, 2ndly, a measure of mere secular, ignoring religious teaching, and therefore very faintly recognising the thousands of schools founded on religious principles which already exist and flourish; or, 3rdly, some such measure as that proposed by Govern-

ment, based upon the well-approved system of the Committee of Council, and endeavouring to enlist the sympathies of the community generally in the maintenance and efficient working of all the schools which the Christian benevolence and zeal of the several religious bodies have already founded or shall hereafter found. We believe that the third of these alternatives is cordially embraced by an overwhelming majority in the country. The only disagreement or doubt refers to matters of detail, on which the time allowed for further consideration and discussion, bringing out more clearly the absolute necessity for mutual concession, will probably lead earnest-minded men of various parties to more complete agreement, before the proposed measure appears in Parliament.

Meanwhile it may be useful if we try quietly to review the position in which the great Education Question now stands. We shall probably find that it has made marked progress, and yet that there is a very wide field still almost untrodden.

We say the *great* Education Question; for we cordially agree in the propriety of that extension of the question which Lord John Russell introduced in his opening speech of April 4. The elementary education of the children of the poor, on which so much attention and energy has hitherto been concentrated, is not the education of the nation. A Ministry really alive to the importance of a thorough national education will think both of rich and poor. Therefore we hold that Lord John Russell was bound to introduce into his speech all those three elements, which many thought it unwise, while all allowed that it was unusual, to combine. A really national system of education must reach the middle and upper classes as well as the poor. Aristocratic Fellows of All Souls, and honourable members who are now Life Guardsmen and have been Gentleman-Commoners of Christ Church, felt themselves somewhat insulted when they heard the reform of the learned body, of which they are distinguished ornaments, mixed up with measures for the better regulation of parish schools, and discussions as to the proportion in which such schools ought to be made dependent on the children's pence; while the governors of our great Public Schools would be shocked at hearing their ancient and dignified Institutions spoken of in the same breath with the whole herd of little grammar schools and other eleemosynary foundations for educating tradesmen's and ploughmen's sons. But the fact is that the time has come when the education of the poor, imperfectly developed as it is, has already made such progress that it has become absolutely necessary for Government to attend to the education of the rich. We should certainly have in a very

few years a complete overturn of social order — ‘now servant is master, and master is man’ — if, when the son of any poor labourer in a common parish school may attain such knowledge as the pupil teachers of any well-regulated village now possess, the squire’s son were to be allowed unmolested to enter, on the quiet possession of his acres, and stand for the representation of his county in Parliament, with that scanty modicum of misunderstood Latin grammar, and Horace committed most imperfectly to memory without being construed, which we fear is sometimes still dignified with the name of education. We are confident that there are many sets of freshmen at present in our universities who know less of arithmetic, history, geography, and, above all, of the Bible, than the first class of the parish school frequented by the children of their fathers’ gamekeepers. Moreover the middle schools frequented by the children of small tradesmen and farmers are notoriously much less efficient than our lower schools. It could not be sound policy, while we greatly improve the education of the children of the poor, to allow that of the higher classes to remain stationary.

Perhaps there is no more important feature in the state of the Education Question, as it now stands before the public, than the growing conviction of the necessity for Government directing its attention to the education of the middle and upper classes. The Charitable Trusts Bill has now become law. There is good reason to hope that, through the operation of this Act, many years will not elapse before the sum of 152,047*l.* per annum, at which the income of the endowed grammar schools is calculated*, together with a fair proportion of the rest of that half million at which Lord Brougham has calculated the annual income of the endowments for education throughout the land†, has been made available for furnishing every locality with a really good middle school. And, moreover, the Duke of Wellington’s examinations for all young men who aspire to bear Her Majesty’s commission in the army, the clause in the Government India Bill throwing open writerships and the higher cadetships to public competition, and Lord John Russell’s warning to the Universities that they have only been spared for a time from Parliamentary reform on the express condition of their labouring to reform themselves — all these are indications that the Education Question is now understood to extend far beyond the schools for the lower orders.

And now, in the interval which the postponement of the

* Sir J. K. Shuttleworth’s *Public Education*, &c., p. 223.

† Ibid. p. 224.

Government Education Bill and the time granted to the Universities allow, we propose to dedicate a few pages to the consideration of some points which we think it would be well to have very seriously considered before the Education Question is again taken up in Parliament.

Following in Lord John Russell's track, we cannot separate the education of the middle and upper from that of the lower classes. Not only must the improvement of all three go hand in hand, if social order is to be preserved; but, in a country so free as ours, where no impassable gulph separates one class from another, the whole body politic must be cemented together, and mutual good feeling must be kept alive by opening easy means of transition for the promising youth of one class to rise into another. Our fathers, in old days, so far as they understood the wants of society, endeavoured in some measure to attain this object. They did not, it is true, think much of the serf-like population of the lowest class; but, through grammar-schools and exhibitions, they tried to unite the middle with the highest class.

The following extract from Mr. Tremenhoe's recent 'Notes on Public Subjects in the United States and Canada' (p. 253.) shows how this important point is attended to by our Canadian fellow-countrymen. The old country is not, we trust, too self-sufficient to be willing to learn from the young.

'In Canada the public grammar-schools, established by an amended Act of 1819, provide a higher education for all who desire it, and are an appropriate supplement to the system of elementary schools. The Act contemplates these schools being set on foot in every district in the province.

'By section 6., ten children may be sent to them by the trustees, to be taught gratis, selected from the most promising pupils in the common schools. By a provision in the Municipal Law of 1849, power is given to the county councils to defray the expense of sending to the college or to the university as many of the pupils of the different public grammar-schools as shall be deserving, and as, in the opinion of the respective masters, shall be of competent attainments for entering into competition for any of the scholarships, exhibitions, or other similar prizes offered by the university or college for competition among such pupils, their parents being unable to bear the expense.'

It is of great importance that we should have amongst ourselves some similar connexion between all our establishments for education, from the lowest to the highest.

Viewing the subject then thus widely, we begin by fully

acknowledging that Lord John Russell deserves the warm thanks of his country for the efforts he has made to spread sound education in every class. But he would himself be the last to maintain that the progress which he hopes to make by the Bills already introduced into Parliament, and the speeches he has already delivered, is to be acquiesced in as sufficient. One of the best points in his labours is the establishment of a system, which will probably greatly extend itself year after year. Great evils cannot be remedied at once: what a wise statesman proposes to himself, when he takes in hand the task of remedying them, will be, to construct the proper machinery and set it in motion, and to look forward to great results as it continues working, though these results may not come till after his own day.

Our object in the present Article is to note some of the points in which our Educational Reform, however it has advanced, is still behind the wants of the age, in its relation to the lower, the middle, and the upper classes. We believe that in each of these departments, even where the deficiency is at present most appalling, Government has taken the first steps towards improvement; but it is wrong to give the impression that there is not much which is amiss still left untouched. We now write in the hope that the plans already auspiciously undertaken may, year by year, be enlarged, and that this great work may prosper more and more in the hands which are engaged in it.

There seems every prospect, with the measures now proposed, that the education of the industrious poor, both in town and country, will soon be thoroughly attended to. The adoption by the Committee of Council of the minutes of 2nd April last, by which greater facilities are given for the erection and maintenance of schools in rural districts, the increase in the number of Inspectors, and the further adoption of the Supplementary Minutes of the 20th of August last with regard to Queen's scholars and certificated teachers, are very important steps in themselves, even independently of the other measures contemplated in the Charitable Trusts Act and the Education Bill. We believe that, henceforward, the chief deficiencies in our educational machinery, which it will be most difficult to remedy, will be found to lie below and above the industrious poor.

What we would now urge, therefore, is the necessity for effectual measures being taken:—

1st. To extend education to the lowest—the destitute and degraded classes:

2nd. To infuse life into the education of the middle class:

3rd. To secure that that thorough reform of the educational

establishments of the higher classes — the Universities and public schools — which the nation imperatively demands, be not frustrated or delayed by the timidity or ignorance, or self-interest, of any persons entrusted with the ordinary administration of these great establishments.

I. And first of the lowest poor. The progress already made is encouraging: 17,015 Church-of-England schools for the poor already working — 1,500 schools of the British and Foreign School Society, besides a fair proportion for the sects* — new schools also rising on every side — and fresh facilities afforded by the Privy Council for building and supporting new schools, as well as adding greatly to the usefulness of the old — all this gives a cheering prospect. We really need not now despair that in a few years all the children of our respectable poor, both in town and country, may have their education well provided for. With regard to these there is no need for any Prussian state-drilling, forcing the children to be taught. We may trust to the spread of right feeling, through the influence of Government schools, which, as their influence is more and more felt, will year by year stir up more of a generous rivalry, and love of sound instruction both amongst parents and children. And all this has a fair prospect of being effected, without any sacrifice of religious principle, by the exertions of the various religious communions, each aided by the State in its efforts to give education according to its conscientious views of what is the best mode of training a Christian child. Lord John Russell may well congratulate himself on the part he has borne in the measures which, since 1839, have produced such good fruit, and which give so rich a promise of much more abundant increase.

But the millions of the respectable poor, whose wants, it is granted, the system of popular education now fairly launched may be expected before many years to meet, are by no means all the poor. We may divide the people of any country in such a state of civilisation as ours, into four classes — the rich — the comfortable — the poor — and the perishing. Sir J. K. Shuttleworth is hardly right†, we think, in calling the classes, the neglect of whose education produces so many social evils, the industrious poor. From want of education individuals and families may sink from the industrious classes to the perishing; but the industrious classes are not usually the parents of crime and misery, and the ignorance that spreads ruin. The perishing

* See Lord John Russell's Speech, April 4. 1853.

† Public Education, p. 46.

are a very large class amongst us: and it is very doubtful whether our educational efforts have as yet made any permanent impression upon this class. The ragged schools, it is true, have neither been idle nor useless. But we have heard the system of ragged schools well described by one of their most zealous and talented supporters, as the working of the pump to keep out of the hold the water which must otherwise sink our vessel. Ragged schools are a temporary expedient to meet a sudden emergency: we cannot do without them; but it would be much better to find some regular system by which the hold could be made perfectly water-tight.

Doubtless, our present schools for the poor, frequented principally by the children of the respectable poor, may be expected in time to work downwards. If a good system is persevered in, they will gradually gain the power to attract and elevate many poor children who are at present outcasts. Sound political economy, as well as sound religion, leads us to expect that the perishing class may gradually be diminished—that at last it may even entirely disappear. The poor whom the Scriptures intimate God intended should never perish out of the land—who will always divide it with the comfortable and the rich—are not the perishing class. There is nothing degrading in that poverty which God's providence seems, by a rule never to be departed from, to have assigned as the lot of the overwhelming majority of the human family in all stages of civilisation. And we may hope that the degraded poverty of the perishing class will in time be almost, if not entirely, absorbed, by general good government, and good financial measures, and the spread of better and more Christian principles through all ranks. But this happy consummation is as yet very far distant. We have now an overwhelming class of outcasts at the bottom of society, whom our present system of popular education has not as yet reached—who are below the influence of our religious ordinances—and scarcely operated on by any wholesome restraints of public opinion. It is certain that such a class is found at present in all the civilised countries of Europe. Nay, the same evil presses hard on our younger brethren of the United States, whom we usually regard as so much happier in this respect than ourselves. Nowhere shall we find more vivid pictures of the misery of such a class than in a New England writer*, and we have all heard of the ex-

* Theodore Parker's *Speeches*, &c. Boston, 1852. Vol. i. p. 135, 136.

cellence of the New England schools. Witness the following extracts which teach a lesson for our own towns:—

‘ Let us look and see how we have disposed of the little ones in Boston,— what we are doing for them or with them. Let me begin with neglected and abandoned children. We all know how large and beautiful a provision is made for the education of the people. About a fourth part of the city taxes are for the public schools. Yet, one not familiar with this place is astonished at the number of idle vagrant boys and girls in the streets. It appears from the late census of Boston, that there are 4948 children between four and fifteen who attend no school. I am not speaking of truants, occasional absentees, but of children whose names are not registered at school, permanent absentees. If we allow that 1948 of these are kept in some sort of restraint by their parents, and have, or have had, some little pains taken with their culture there still remain 3000 children who never attend any school, turned loose into your streets. Suppose there is some error in the counting, that the number is overstated one third. still there are left 2000 young vagrants in the streets of Boston. What have these abandoned children to help them? Nothing, literally nothing. They are idle, though their bodies crave activity. They are poor, ill clad and ill fed. There is nothing about them to foster self-respect: nothing to call forth their conscience, to awaken and cultivate their sense of religion. They find themselves beggars in the wealth of a city; idlers in the midst of its work. Yes, savages in the midst of its civilisation. If you could know the life of one of these poor lepers of Boston, you would wonder and weep. He was born unwelcome amid wretchedness and want. His coming increased both. Miserably he struggles through his infancy, less tended than the lion’s whelp. He becomes a boy, he is covered only with rags, and these squalid with long accumulated filth. He wanders about your streets too low even to seek employment; now snatching from the gutter half-rotten fruit, which the owner flings away. He is ignorant: he has never entered a school-house: to him even the alphabet is a mystery.’

Again, addressing the Teachers’ Institute, at Syracuse, New York, the same writer says:—

‘ The children of most parents are easily brought to school by a little diligence on the part of the teachers and school committee; but there are also children of low and abandoned, or at least neglected parents, who live in a state of continual truancy: they are found on the banks of your canals, they

‘swarm in your large cities. When these children become men they remain dwarfs, and are barbarians in the midst of society.’*

This Republican writer proceeds in a passage which shows none of our English squeamishness lest we infringe the parent's liberty to do his child a great wrong, and which might have served as the peroration of Lord Shaftesbury's speech on this subject, in the House of Lords:—

‘If a man abandons the body of his child, the State adopts that body for a time, takes the guardianship thereof for the child's own sake, sees that it is housed, fed, clad and cared for. If a man abandons his child's spirit, and the child commits a crime, the State, for its own sake, assumes the temporary guardianship thereof, and puts him in jail. When a man deserts his child, taking no concern about his education, I venture to make the suggestion, whether it would not be well, as the last resort, for the State to assume the guardianship of the child for its own sake, and for the child's sake. We allow no one with ever so thick a skin to grow up in nakedness. Why should we allow a child with ever so perverse a parent to grow up in ignorance and degenerate into crime? Certainly, a naked man is not so dangerous to society as an ignorant man, nor is the spectacle so revolting.’

Then speaking of the Asylum for Juvenile Offenders, and the State Reform School, for ‘lads who break the law,’ he adds: ‘Would it not be better to take one step more,—adopt them before they offended, and allow no child to grow up in the barbarism of ignorance? Has any man an unalienable right to live a savage in the midst of civilisation?’†

We heartily wish success to Lord Shaftesbury's attempt to introduce some such compulsion amongst the nomad hordes of wild children in the Metropolis, and we are glad to see his exertions extending from London to the provinces. It is right, however, to note that an evil similar to that of which we are now speaking spreads beyond the ragged class for which Lord Shaftesbury has so zealously laboured. Mr. Tramenheere has published the following statement, made to him by the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. A like statement might be made as to every town in Great Britain. ‘Under the present state of things, our system does not reach the whole population in our manufacturing towns. The parents themselves neglect the edu-

* Theodore Parker's Speeches, &c., vol. i. p. 424.

† *Ibid.* p. 425.

'cation of their children, and the manufacturing companies sometimes evade the spirit of the law, which requires a certain amount of attendance at school of children under a certain age.* Might not this pass for an extract from Mr. Horner's Report on the state of our own towns? We have preferred to give the above extracts from writings which speak of America, because they seem to show better than any purely English authority that, without some efforts such as have never yet been made amongst us, the evil is incurable.† We are led to regard public education in the New England States as reduced to a well-matured system, and very flourishing: most of the friends of popular education amongst ourselves would feel well pleased if they thought our system likely soon to be equally efficient; but we here see from New England testimony how little the real difficulties which oppose the spread of education in the lowest class can be met by the best arranged system of a perfectly voluntary education, while all parents are left free to refuse its blessings to their children if they will.

The Secretary to the Massachusetts Board continues, after deploring that so many children are deprived of education by their parents' fault:—

'It is not the special duty of the School Committees to correct this evil, and it will probably be necessary for the towns to appoint some person of influence or with more or less of legal authority to look after such children and bring them to school. A gentleman at Roxberry, Mr. Ritchie, employed by the city authorities, has made this experiment, and he has informed me that he has so far succeeded as to be of opinion that the attendance of all the children of school-age can be secured in this way by the appointment of an officer of this kind.'

In England, the clergyman of the parish and his district visitors do much in this way by persuasion; but mild persuasion is powerless against the greatness of the evil; and a grave question arises whether the time has not come when some legal authority must be given, not to persuade, but to command. It was, doubtless, from feeling the force of such arguments that Lord John Russell introduced the 28th clause into his Bill:—

* Notes on Public Subjects, &c., p. 44.

† We believe that an honest inquiry into the state of Education in the mining districts of Durham and Northumberland, for example, would disclose a frightful amount of neglect. We should be glad to see one of Her Majesty's inspectors give public circulation to some account of these districts in a short and easily accessible form.

‘ For the purpose of extending the benefits of education among
 ‘ the poor, the clerks to every Board of Guardians of any parish
 ‘ or union wholly or in part within any borough in which this Act
 ‘ shall be in operation, shall, at the end of each quarter of a year,
 ‘ or oftener if required by the School Committee, report in
 ‘ writing to the School Committee of such borough the names
 ‘ and places of abode of such poor children between the ages
 ‘ of four and twelve years, resident within the borough, as
 ‘ are not attending any school, and who themselves, or whose
 ‘ parents or guardians, are in the receipt of out-door relief; and
 ‘ the guardians of such parish or union may require such child
 ‘ to attend some school in such borough, subject to such rules
 ‘ and regulations as the Poor-Law Board shall issue in the
 ‘ matter, and during such attendance shall pay on his or her
 ‘ behalf at the rate of twopence per week, for his or her educa-
 ‘ tion, to the managers, trustees, or proprietors of such school.’

Considering how very uncertain are the periods for which able-bodied persons with families usually receive outdoor relief, it may be doubted how far this clause will avail practically to meet the great evil complained of. And, again, Lord Shaftesbury’s Bill for the prevention of juvenile mendicancy applied only to London. If good for London, its principle must be good for Manchester and Liverpool and every large town. Sir J. K. Shuttleworth has shown that, in Manchester and Salford, of the poor children between the ages of three and fifteen, amounting in all to somewhat less than 100,000, there are about 40,000 who are not at work, and yet receive no instruction.* No great progress has as yet been made in devising the best means to remedy this pressing evil. But something has been done if men are made to understand, that, in order to secure the education of the lowest class, it is not enough to establish and encourage good schools.

Another clause in Lord John Russell’s Bill is very important as bearing on the state of the neglected poor:—‘ 17.
 ‘ The School Committee of any borough may, from time to
 ‘ time, in accordance with regulations to be duly made by
 ‘ them and approved of by the Committee of Council, grant
 ‘ such sums as such School Committee may deem requisite
 ‘ towards the opening, and for such period as they shall de-
 ‘ termine towards the support, of an evening school to be con-
 ‘ ducted in any school in such borough admitted to the benefit
 ‘ of this Act.’

We should be glad to see a provision for encouraging evening

* Public Education, Appendix F., p. 475.

schools extended to the country districts. With all our efforts there must ever remain a great difficulty in securing for the children of the very poor such an amount of attendance at the day school as will make their education real. The claims of daily sustenance must be attended to. The children of the very poor cannot be made to go to a day-school except for a few years; and a great many of them, when they go to work, will soon forget all they have ever learned. Evening schools will enable instruction to be continued after their working life has begun, and any supposed hardship of compulsion would be much diminished if the alternative of an evening school be offered when parents cannot live without their children's help. We trust, therefore, that this clause in the Government Bill will not be overlooked, and that the principle it embodies will soon be extended in its application. We believe that much may be done by evening schools for a further and truer education of the very poor. But the whole question of the education of the lowest class requires to be very carefully considered, and to be made, as soon as possible the subject of specific legislation.

II. And now we turn to the education of the middle class. It is not to be expected that farmers and tradesmen should send their children to be the playfellows of the children of day-labourers in the parish schools. Great efforts may for a time overcome such scruples in some exceptional case, as has been proved by the Dean of Hereford at King's Sonborne; but the middle, as well as the upper classes, know that the education which is suitable for the very poor will not meet their wants, and they have their own ideas of accustoming their children to keep up their position in society. Hence they are sure to look out for separate schools. We desire, therefore, to see a good middle school in every district, and we much fear that good schools of this class are at present very rare. Such schools are at present usually private speculations. Not unfrequently in our country towns a master or mistress whom the Government inspector has not found qualified to conduct a school for the poor, being obliged to resign as unfit, opens a private school for a higher class, which is immediately crowded. In this school, instruction is given according to antiquated methods; the enlightenment which has so changed the whole education of the poor is thus carefully excluded from the instruction of their superiors. The highest perfection of the middle-school scholar is often a copperplate-like handwriting, and an overburdened memory, to which the girls add very elegant worsted work, and the boys a very neat system of book-keeping. The

pupils' knowledge of the globe consists probably in a wonderful facility of going through the geography book by rote. If lessons in Religion have been given at all, they have probably been confined to a parrot-like repetition of such manuals as Watts's Scripture History; and for such very meagre instruction ten shillings a quarter at the least is paid—five or six times as much as may command a really good education in a lower school. But the farmer or tradesman would think he was doing his children an injustice, if he did not try to give them the peculiar advantage of a middle school. Often he will make a great sacrifice to board them at a distance from home, that they may have such advantages. Now, as the middle class is ready to pay for such schools, an effort ought certainly to be made to secure that they are good of their kind. We do not see that Government is called upon to give any money to aid in the establishment of such schools: the class whose wants are sought to be supplied are rich enough to pay for themselves; but it is much to be desired that Government should give the benefit of superintendence and advice. It would be well also if some system were devised by which certificates of fitness were given on examination to masters and mistresses for this class, that managers of such schools and parents might thus have some guide to the selection of proper teachers. The founders of our old grammar schools were in the habit of seeking such guidance by insisting on the necessity of the master having taken a University degree. We hardly know whether it be principally to the Government or the Church, or to whom, that the middle class are now to look for such assistance; but with their own limited education they are obviously not at present able, without extraneous aid, to establish in all localities a good system for themselves. They will have great reason to complain, and great social evils will be the result, if their children are allowed to remain under their present disadvantages.

There ought to be a thoroughly good middle school well taught and well looked after in every district. There are now scattered through the country forty training schools for schoolmasters and schoolmistresses under Government inspection (*vide* Sir J. K. Shuttleworth's *Public Education*, p. 107.). In some few cases, middle schools have been sought to be attached to these. We believe that the Committee of Council has hitherto felt some reluctance to sanction such union, though we do not, we confess, understand upon what ground. But, if the middle and training schools are not allowed to be closely connected, at least advantages might arise from their being placed in the same locality, that the approved staff which governs

and inspects the training school may, without inconvenience or any great expense, exercise some superintendence over the middle school.

We ask also what are the cathedrals doing in this matter? Has not each of them an ancient grammar school attached to it? This grammar school ought forthwith to be divided into two departments. In one let the old instruction in Latin and Greek be rigidly maintained; but let the other be ordered on the most improved principles of a modern middle school. What King Edward's School is for Birmingham — the great centre of its Christian civilisation — that the cathedral school ought to be in every diocese. Let the management of the cathedral schools be thoroughly investigated; let their system of instruction be greatly extended; let them be subjected to some vigilant superintendence, and we shall soon have a great change. The clergy often complain that the middle classes are the stronghold of dissent. Can any infatuation, then, be greater than neglecting this obvious means which the cathedral schools offer for uniting them in their youth by the best possible associations to the Church?

The Government have now taken a most important step towards the improvement of middle-class education by their Charitable Trusts Act. We have seen how great is the income of the charitable endowments for education throughout the kingdom. Of this a very large proportion is available for the education of the middle class. We are henceforward to have a distinct and easily accessible authority, similar to that of the Committee of Council on Education, exercising a general control over all such charitable funds. Like the Education Committee, the Board of Charity Commissioners is to have the power of issuing minutes to prescribe the rules according to which the work of the department will be conducted by its inspectors and other officers. It will make all preliminary inquiries as to the mode in which educational charities are administered, and this without cost; and the judges of the local courts, in the case of small charities, or, in the larger, the Master of the Rolls or the Vice-Chancellors sitting at chambers, are henceforward authorised summarily to carry into effect improvements which hitherto have been attainable only by a tedious and expensive chancery suit. Also it is the duty of the Charity Commissioners, where the alterations required in the application or administration of any charity are such as cannot be carried into effect by judicial authority, to prepare new schemes for a better appropriation of the funds of the charity.

and submit these schemes to Parliament, that they may be made law at the public expense.

We see in this a bright prospect of better days for the improvement of our ancient grammar schools; and one of the first improvements which we think ought to be made in them is, the establishment in each of an English or commercial department which shall give thoroughly good and useful instruction to the middle class.

We would not interfere with the Greek and Latin of the old Grammar School. All who wish it ought to have a classical education to prepare them for the Universities and the learned professions; and every facility should be given to such scholars of the middle or English school as show much promise of classical attainments, to go on in this line. Continually recruited by means of small exhibitions given to promising boys, who wish to rise from the schools for the poor below,—holding out as a reward to its own promising scholars the prospect of rising, if they are fit for it, to the Grammar School and the University,—placed under the charge of some thoroughly well educated master, and regularly subjected each year to some system of examination and inspection, our middle schools will attain new life and energy, and the children of farmers and small tradesmen may be thoroughly well instructed and trained. A good system, designed to effect this, cannot long be persisted in without producing a marked improvement in the whole middle class.* The new generation will be more intelligent, more diligent, more orderly in all their habits, and it will be the fault of the clergy if they are not also, by God's blessing, more religious than their fathers.

III. We come now to the education of the higher orders. We have seen how intimately the middle schools must be connected with the Grammar Schools. In England there is no sharp line of separation cutting off class from class. The Charity Commissioners will, we trust, soon find means for insisting that there shall be a good classical grammar school in every town. Here the children of the upper classes in the town must be so trained that, if they wish it, they may go straight from school to the Universities. These higher grammar schools, like the middle schools, must be periodically inspected and examined, and their funds must, if possible, be made available for assisting

* We must not forget how much is likely soon to be attained, for the improvement of Education in all the principal towns, by the well-directed efforts of the Board of Trade in its department of Science and Art.

the deserving to finish their studies at the University. Steps must be taken to secure that the prize of such assistance is never given except to merit tested by examination; and there will soon be no deserving boy in the kingdom in the lowest rank who may not, if his talents fit him for such promotion, win the highest University education by his industry.

Amongst the schools thus subjected to improvement there ought to be no exceptions. Eton and Westminster and Winchester call for the attention of the Commissioners as much as any other schools. The best interests of the country demand that these splendid institutions be made thoroughly useful—that all of them be opened to the easy admission of the best possible system of government and teaching. Is it notorious that, in the noble foundation of William of Wykeham, all the assistance which his munificence destined to promote learning is now made a matter of family patronage—that scholars are chosen from Winchester to New College not by merit, but by favour—that a place on the foundation is often promised to a child the moment he is born? Are nominations at the Charterhouse equally a matter of favour? The country has a right to a sifting examination into the condition of all the public schools, and an immediate reform of all such abuses. Some of the public schools are happily reformed already; but others—and these in some instances possessed of the noblest endowments—are believed to be greatly mismanaged. A proper administration of the public schools must go hand-in-hand with a proper administration of the Universities.

And now comes the greatest of all educational questions: What are we to expect in University Reform? We must be excused if we enter on this matter at considerable length. For the details of the subject are as yet but imperfectly understood by the public, and we apprehend that the friends of improvement are here threatened with a determined and systematic opposition, which, though it cannot ultimately prevail, may still make head against the best interests of the country for many years.

Fifteen months have passed since the Oxford and Cambridge Commissioners reported. Has any improvement as yet taken place? We have now before us the mature opinion of a Committee of the governing body of Oxford as to the reforms which may safely be conceded; and certainly, even if the Board of Heads shall think fit to act on the recommendations of this Committee, their improvements will not go to the root of the matter. Lord John Russell hit the nail on the head when he announced in his place in Parliament, that the Government would be satisfied with no scheme of University Reform.

which did not contain arrangements for the following improvements:

1. The removal of restrictions on elections to fellowships, so that they shall become real rewards of merit.

2. An efficient alteration of the governing body of the University.

3. A great extension of the University to classes hitherto excluded.

4. The application of some portion of the college endowments towards the adequate payment of professors, that thus the Universities may be enabled to command the services of a body of really intelligent instructors.

Lord John Russell threw out incidentally a fifth suggestion of more doubtful expediency, viz., that the tenure of fellowships ought to be limited to comparatively a few years. The Commissioners have not recommended this change, and, perhaps, its introduction in Lord John's speech may be taken as a symptom that the Ministry believes public opinion to have gone beyond the Commissioners.* Certainly we have proof here of a strong conviction on the part of the Ministry that the present system on which fellowships are held must be very extensively altered. The very unsatisfactory state of the colleges of Oxford has principally forced this conclusion upon the public mind. The Commissioners state† that the colleges of Oxford 'receive, it is said, not much less than 150,000*l.* per annum between them from endowments, exclusively of what is paid by the students. This might be rendered a noble provision for learning and science; but if these endowments were multiplied tenfold, and distributed to a tenfold number of fellows elected,' (as in the overwhelming majority of cases at present), 'without reference to their talents and acquirements, little would result but increased odium to the University. The architectural magnificence of Oxford would be diminished, and many excellent men would suffer, and great opportunities of future good will be lost, if several of its richest colleges were swept away; but little present loss would be sustained by the University, the Church, or the nation.'

In these matters Oxford is the great offender. Magdalen

* The arguments against such a change seem to us very grave. Scarcely anything which has yet been proposed would more surely tend to the ruin of the collegiate system of which our Universities are justly very tenacious. Even now it is difficult for a Fellow to look upon his college as a home: after such a change this would be impossible.

† Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 151.

College, Oxford, possesses, it is stated, an income not widely different from that of Trinity College, Cambridge.* The fellows of Magdalen are forty in number. The value of the junior fellowships is returned by Mr. Senior at 250*l.* a year.† The value of the senior fellowships is known to be very much greater. These forty fellows, with the president, educate some twenty-two persons. These twenty-two persons ought certainly to be well educated, for it would appear that an income of not less than 15,000*l.* a year of endowments, at the least, besides all they contribute themselves in the shape of college fees, produces no fruit but their instruction. Yet, strange to say, this college is not particularly famous for the honours attained by its undergraduates. We believe it has gained one first class in classics during the last six years. But, perhaps, the forty fellows are all prosecuting their own learned studies, and have no time to give to instruction. If so, the results of their studies have not yet appeared. And Trinity College, Cambridge, with similar endowments, educates some 400 undergraduates, and vindicates for itself the noblest place in all competitions for university honours, and has of late years numbered amongst its fellows the greatest galaxy of distinguished names to be found in the lists of any educational establishment in the world. No wonder that the fellows of Magdalen have provoked the Ministry to declare that their slumbers must be rudely broken, and that in future, unless they show themselves more useful, they must be turned out of their fellowships at the end of seven years. But, the extraordinary contrast between Magdalen, Oxford, and Trinity College, Cambridge, may be easily accounted for by the fact, that the fellowships of Trinity are the rewards of merit, tested by examination, and are open to the generous competition of a large body of distinguished scholars; while at Magdalen, the process by which the fellows have been selected is as follows:—A boy of seventeen or eighteen has been chosen to a scholarship because he was born in a certain county; if several candidates offered themselves from the favoured county, it depended on the conscience or caprice of the person who had the nomination whether he would select the best scholar or his own nephew. And it is notorious that claims of kindred or private friendships have continually turned the scale. The boy thus elected to a scholarship has succeeded to his fellowship as a matter of course. It is not surprising that thus chosen, and thus carefully guarded from the necessity of exertion to secure their further advance-

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 152. † Ibid. p. 223.

ment, the monks of Magdalen should be somewhat given to repose. No wonder that the fellows of this college should not be great Reformers. A slight change for the better in the mode of electing to scholarships has, indeed, been introduced since Lord John Russell showed that he was in earnest in the determination to reform. Of the candidates who offer themselves from the favoured county the best is now selected by the College officers; but the competition is still narrowed further than the statutes require, and the scholar once elected is still allowed to succeed to his fellowship without further competition, retaining his scholarship for this purpose far beyond the statutable age.* Magdalen, unfortunately, is only a type of many colleges, and who can be surprised that such a system of electing fellows has inflicted deep injury on the whole University?

'There are in Oxford 542 fellowships. . . . From this body of men has to be selected all the studying and all the educating power of the University—all the professors, all the tutors, all those who pursue learning for its own sake, and beyond the needs of practical life.

'Out of this number only 22 are in such a sense open, that a young man on first coming up sees his way clear towards them with no other bar than may arise from his own want of talents or diligence. The rest are almost all restricted to: 1st, Persons born in particular localities; 2nd, Founders' kin; 3rd, Persons educated in particular schools. The only fellowships not so restricted are 10 at Balliol, 12 at Oriel, and 61 at Christ Church; and the latter are practically close, being in the gift of the canons in rotation, who treat them very much as private property.' †

The same evidence has said:

'The system of election to fellowships is above all other defects at Oxford that whose remedy is most needed and most important. . . . If no other change were made than to throw all the fellowships open, . . . all other reforms would follow spontaneously. A body of men elected in the interests of learning would be sure in course of time to adapt everything to the needs of learning.'

The Government therefore have done wisely in announcing that they will not rest satisfied unless restrictions on the elec-

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, pp. 221, 222, 223.

† Ibid. quoting Mr. Temple's Evidence, p. 149. The real state of the case as to close fellowships in Oxford is the more necessary to be insisted on, because a table has recently been published which is calculated to give a very erroneous impression. Some of the closest fellowships in the University are therein paraded as wholly free from local restrictions. It cannot be too often repeated, that out of more than 500 fellowships in Oxford only 22 are bestowed simply with reference to merit.

tions to fellowships be removed, and they be thrown open to public competition. We shall consider the prospects of reform, first, as relates to this head.

1. How are fellowships to be thrown open? At Cambridge, from happy circumstances, the restrictions are comparatively few. But we see how they cripple Oxford. Now, this reform cannot be effected by the colleges themselves. The heads and fellows of colleges are bound to the inviolable observation of their statutes by oaths.* 'The oath imposed upon the fellows of New College fills more than three closely printed octavo pages; that of the warden no less than five. The following clauses of the oath refer to the observance of statutes. They are found almost in the same words in the codes of Magdalen and Corpus. . . . "I will in no wise "entertain any other statutes or ordinances, interpretations, "changes, injunctions, declarations, expositions, or any other "glosses anywise repugnant to the present ordinances and statutes, or to the true sense and meaning of the same. . . . "Nor will I consent to such—nor in any manner acknowledge "them—nor obey them at any time—nor take notice of them "—nor in any way use them, or any one of them, in the "college or abroad, directly or indirectly." The observance of such oaths is enforced by the founder of Magdalen, 'under the pain of anathema and the wrath of Almighty God.' It is true that in many very important points the statutes, obedience to which is sought thus awfully to be enforced, neither are nor can be obeyed. But the oath still presents an insuperable barrier to a deliberate alteration of the statutes by the fellows themselves. It seems strange, that, after the disclosures made with respect to these oaths, even a single session should have been allowed to pass without a Bill being brought into Parliament to render such oaths illegal. Their profanity is a scandal, independently of the obstacle which they present to all improvement. We trust that the Ministry are prepared to deal with them early next Session. The Committee of the Oxford Heads of Houses has recommended that such oaths should be 'prohibited by the Law of the Land.' Vide Report, p. 92.

But, even supposing these shameful oaths removed, the difficulty is by no means overcome. No college in Oxford has power to alter its own statutes. Neither has the visitor such power; on the contrary, it is his especial duty as visitor to see that they are obeyed. There are a few exceptions where the sovereign founder; but, speaking generally, we know of no practicable way

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 146.

in which such statutes can be altered except by the authority of Parliament. As matters stand at present, even if the oaths were removed, all that the colleges themselves and the visitors could possibly do would be to beg Parliament to exercise such authority.

The Government has announced that it will only wait a short time to see whether the Universities are themselves disposed to introduce the required changes. We presume Lord John Russell never intended that the University should itself effect the changes he specified. With regard to the particular change of throwing open fellowships, neither the University as a body nor the separate colleges have any power. In this particular, at least, we presume it is not acts, but suggestions, that the Government has waited for.

No real University reform is possible without a reform of the colleges. We see that, with regard to this most pressing matter of reform, the colleges have no power. It remains to inquire how far, since the warning so distinctly given by Government, they have manifested a willingness to make suggestions in the proper quarter, and to invoke other aid where they are themselves powerless. The attempts made to open any fellowships have as yet been very faint. Pembroke College, in Oxford, indeed, of which one of the Commissioners is Master, and which is most miserably depressed by close fellowships, has tried to move. But, if Pembroke has Dr. Jeune for its Master, it has Lord Derby for its Visitor; and there seems little doubt, from what he is reported to have announced, that Lord Derby will use his influence against the movement for opening the fellowships.

In some other colleges besides Pembroke, there have been symptoms of a desire to move; but the desire is different from the power. In most cases the desire extends to a small fraction of the society; and therefore the obstructive majority simply extinguishes all hope of improvement by its vote. In some instances the visitor seems to have been appealed to merely that the sanction of his authority may be given to the continuance of existing evils.

The time must, of course, be limited during which the Government can with propriety wait for the suggestions of the University and colleges. There are not wanting symptoms that that time has now expired. Last Session was too fruitful of great measures of pressing importance to leave any reason for complaint as to the delay which has hitherto occurred. But with respect to the opening of Fellowships, we now hope for speedy action. The Government, by the Charitable Trusts Act,

has constituted an authority to effect the alteration of statutes and wills of founders in the case of all other charities. We trust that they are prepared forthwith to take similar vigorous steps for the improvement of our Oxford and Cambridge colleges. The Committee of the Oxford Heads (vide Report, p. 92.) seem to approve of the interference of Parliament that a proper central power may be constituted to sanction necessary change: but, strange to say, they have recorded their deliberate opinion that any general opening of scholarships or fellowships to public competition is neither necessary nor desirable (vide pp. 93. 95.). The Government, on the contrary, has rightly selected the opening of fellowships as the most important point in college-reform. In this matter nothing can be done without the interference of Parliament.

But perhaps, though powerless as yet in this particular, the colleges are eagerly at work to effect other reforms. We trust this may be found to be so; but we confess we have but little hope of any great general movement in the colleges from within. The best colleges — those which least need improvement — will probably be ready to improve; but those in which improvement is most needed are precisely those in which nothing will be done. If an enabling Act were passed to-morrow, the worst colleges would not avail themselves of its powers. The Oxford Commissioners* state that ‘the Duke of Wellington is reported to have assured the House of Lords, in 1838, that the heads of houses had undertaken to revise the statutes of their several colleges;’ but that, ‘whatever may have been their wish and intention, no result has ensued.’ His Grace is reported to have said, on the 9th of July, 1838 †: ‘With respect to the colleges; I have received accounts from several of them that they are reviewing their statutes. Several of the colleges are in communication with their respective visitors; and others are in communication with the fellows of the college with whom they must communicate in order to make effectual reforms in their statutes. They are going on as well as they can at the present moment; and I entreat your Lordships to let them work out these reforms as they think fit; and if they are not executed in accordance with your Lordships’ wishes, it will then be time for the House to take such steps as may seem necessary.’ This was the game by which the colleges eluded the demand for reform fifteen years ago. They made a show of being very busy in reforming themselves; and it all ended,

* Report, p. 148.

† Ibid. p. 7.

as it was sure to end, in their doing nothing. Let the Government beware how it is deluded again by the same game.

Be it understood distinctly, that when we thus speak of the colleges, we readily acknowledge the existence of a few honourable exceptions; but we speak of such societies in Oxford as Magdalen, New College, Queen's. It pains us to do so; but we fear in justice we ought to add that there is little hope of internal reform in Christ Church, which has of late years sadly fallen from its high supremacy.

All practically acquainted with Oxford know that it contains a few good and many bad colleges. Most of the good colleges will no doubt exert themselves to accomplish internal reform where it is possible; and they will gladly hail higher assistance from without in those points in which statutes and legal rights have made them powerless to improve. The bad colleges will do nothing. If they appear to be busy, this is merely a feint. A few active spirits, in such a college, may be trying to bring about improvement; but they are a small minority, sure to be outvoted, and have no real power.

One college in Oxford has indeed greatly distinguished itself during the year of waiting; and its fellows deserve the thanks of the country. The founder of Corpus Christi College designed it to be a great place of education. He looked forward to its exercising a marked influence on the studies of the whole University. For this purpose he appointed that there should be lecturers in Greek, Latin, and Theology, to give instruction to the whole University, who should receive adequate payment from the funds of his college.* These lectureships had long fallen into complete abeyance: as at Magdalen, the founder of which made a similar provision, the office of public lecturer had long existed merely in name. The same system by which the cathedral schools have so greatly suffered, and by which the Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, continued to pay to the Regius Professors 40*l.*, when that sum, originally equivalent to more than two fellowships, has, from the altered value of money, become a totally inadequate remuneration, had proved fatal to the lecturers of Corpus. This was pointed out in the Commissioners' Report. There certainly was no legal obligation on the present holders of fellowships to remedy a defect which had gradually crept in from ancient times, and in which they might well have thought they had no responsibility. The world could hardly have found any fault with them if they had urged that similar evils had crept unperceived into almost every an-

* Vide Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 229.

cient foundation in the kingdom, and had represented that the funds now divided amongst the Head and Fellows were not more than sufficient for their proper maintenance, and that therefore they could not be expected to make a large deduction from their moderate private incomes for public purposes which have long been in desuetude. It is thus that every cathedral in England, and most colleges in both Universities, have reasoned under similar circumstances. It is thus, we presume, that Mr. Whiston reasons at Trinity, where he is a member of the body that shares in the dividend, though he is very vehement in maintaining the opposite argument at Rochester. But the President and Fellows of Corpus resolved in this matter to act with a noble disinterestedness; and they have given an example to every corporation in the land. The University was casting about for the means of endowing a new professorship of Latin. The Fellows of Corpus called to mind what the Commissioners' Report had pointed out to them of the long-neglected intentions of their founder; and they came forward, we are told, with a proposition, that by a tax upon their own moderate incomes, they should raise at once 300*l.*, and ultimately 600*l.* a year* and place it at the disposal of the University for the endowment of this professorship. Such an act shows the spirit which animates the good colleges. Corpus has begun vigorously to carry out other reforms; and it has a few coadjutors in the same praiseworthy course. We shall soon, we trust, hear of petitions from the better colleges to the Legislature imploring such assistance as will enable them to effect real and lasting reforms.

But, as we have said before, the number of colleges which can be expected thus to petition the Legislature to aid them in the work of self reform is very limited. Some love the present bad system. Others are restrained simply by the *vis inertiae* inherent in corporations.

All Souls, with its stately buildings and magnificent library, its forty fellowships and its revenue of 9000*l.* a year, shows no symptom of departing from its present position of an agreeable country club, offering, as its contribution to the cause of learning, the education of three Bible clerks.* The head and fellows are understood not to be averse to change; but they feel no call to originate it, and know not how to set to work. If the work is done for them by Government, it is probable they will readily acquiesce. But they are men who love an elegant and easy life—scattered throughout the country or in foreign parts. It would be really too much to expect of them, that they are de-

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 219.

liberately to disquiet their peaceful existence by taking upon themselves all the labour of a very difficult reform.

All Souls supplies one type, Queen's another. Let any one read the account of Queen's in the 201st page of the Oxford Commissioners' Report. Here is a great society with noble endowments, a princely library, buildings of great beauty and extent capable of accommodating 100 students, with richly endowed fellowships, which the founder certainly intended should not be exclusively confined. While he was evidently anxious that persons 'sprung from the counties of Westmoreland and Cumberland, and especially those of his own blood,' should have a preference, he expressly declares that the ground of his preference for the northern counties was to be found in the circumstances of his own time; and in his own time he only selected one Fellow out of twelve from these counties. He states his wish that no race or well-deserving nation should be excluded, 'so that the election should be as general as the collection of scholars to the University is universal.' The mode in which these intentions are carried out at present is as follows: The preference to the kindred of the founder is disregarded entirely, but that given to the natives of the northern counties has been converted by long usage into an absolute exclusion of all others. No person not born in Cumberland and Westmoreland is received as a candidate. The society openly violates the founder's express injunction that no one shall be elected who is not a master of arts, rather than allow the competition to be thrown open beyond the favoured clique. The college, consequently, has declined. Its numbers are small—its reputation not good. The best specimens even of the two favoured counties shun the college. A prudent father prefers that his son, if a lad of talent, should push his way unaided in a good and open society rather than be ruined by the sure possession of 300*l.* a year in a dull place where there is no competition and no intellectual life. For twenty years one or two energetic reformers, rising above the narrow clique, in which, to their loss, they have found themselves, have striven to cleanse this Augean stable; but they have been powerless against the surrounding mass. Men intended by nature for trade or agriculture, forced by the monopoly of the favoured counties into the situation of fellows, of what ought to be a learned society, feel naturally enough that they cannot make up their minds to destroy the very system to which they owe their livelihood. At any college meeting in which there is fear of improvement, a rush is made from the remote country districts, where these Bæotians, between audit and audit, forget the difficulties of their false

position in society more congenial to their tastes than is to be found in a learned university, and all propositions for improvement are met with dogged obstinacy. Unless we are misinformed, this very summer, after the Report of the Commission, in spite of the Government warning, and the indignant remonstrance of all who really wish the college well, the same tactics have been repeated.

The Government need hesitate no longer. This college at least has deliberately declared that it holds all reform in abhorrence. And strange to say, this college boasts that it has no regular visitor, and is responsible, therefore, for its misdoings to no head on earth.* Parliament cannot further overlook such a state of things. Even if other societies were to remain untouched, a Bill must be introduced for the improvement of Queen's College. The little good it does is to enable by its Exhibitions a few deserving youths to come to Oxford, whose circumstances would otherwise exclude them. But this charitable office it could perform far better if it were thoroughly reformed. Its existence in its present state is a prostitution of noble endowments, and a real injury to the cause of education and learning. ♦

II. The second, like the third and the fourth Government head of reform, concerns the University directly, without the intervention of the colleges. And there is little doubt that in matters included under all these three heads the University can, if it pleases, move for itself. When we say the University can move, we mean, when we speak of Oxford, the Heads of Houses can.† In Cambridge the matter is different; but it is well known that in Oxford nothing can be changed in the University unless the Heads of Houses consent to set the change in motion. And the first modest demand which the Government has made on the locomotive power of these functionaries, is, that they should displace themselves. A narrow oligarchy, the members of which depend on their present position for much of their social importance, is courteously requested to resign its exclusive privileges. We can hardly think that the Government seriously expected any very effectual change to originate from this quarter. It must be merely that Government very properly wished to avoid the appearance of acting roughly: and was contented to wait courteously for a time, that it might act more effectually at last.

* Oxford Report, p. 203.

† In this particular matter — the alteration of the governing body in Oxford — the consent of the Crown will be required.

Meanwhile, this courteous conduct of the Government must not be carried too far. They have to deal with a body which, powerless for any great improvement in this particular matter, has a wonderful vitality in all its powers of obstruction. We have already seen how it managed to play off the Duke of Wellington for fifteen years. And now, as fifteen years ago, the Heads of Houses profess that they are very busy in the work of internal reform. No sooner had it become evident that Government would insist on reform, than they immediately appointed a committee. This committee, we understand, sat for three days of each week from January to June. The discussions have, of course, been private: but even from the innermost recesses of such a sanctuary a few secrets percolate to the outer air. The report of this committee is now before the public; but long before its publication, the project of reform in University government, which it was to contain, was pretty generally known: so that it has already received a good deal of consideration in Oxford. The reform of the governing body of the University—what is called the Hebdomadal Board—at present a narrow oligarchy, consisting of the two Proctors and twenty-four Heads of Houses, who have an exclusive power of originating every University measure, and who are sadly ignorant of the wants and feelings of the University—is the one University Reform which men of every shade of opinion in Oxford, not themselves members of the oligarchy, have united in loudly demanding. The destruction of this oligarchy is felt by all parties to be the indispensable preliminary before anything really useful can be done. Goaded by attacks from all quarters, the Committee of the Oxford Heads has found it impossible to resist all change: but we cannot bring ourselves to think that the change they are willing to concede, even supposing the General Board of Heads to approve it, will be accepted by the University or the country. The oligarchy, we have seen, consists of twenty-four Heads of Houses and the two Proctors—the last being Masters of Arts who hold their office only for one year, and who, therefore, are completely powerless against their twenty-four colleagues installed for life. The committee recommends a concession to public opinion by proposing the introduction of eight other Masters of Arts. It is obviously very easy for twenty-four permanent members of a board to overpower eight interlopers. The Tutors and Professors will not be satisfied with such a representation. In the Oxford Board of Heads of Houses are many estimable, and some really able, men; but, as a body, they are most singularly ignorant of the state of

public feeling both within and without the University. Were it not hopeless, we should beg of the General Board of Heads of Houses, when they meet, to consider what practical measures ought to be founded on the recommendations of their Committee—what steps are necessary in consequence of the Home Secretary's recent letter to their Chancellor—to reperuse the evidence in the Commissioners' report as to the universal feeling which condemns their present board. They may rest assured that no change less sweeping than that by which the Commissioners propose to place a large share of the government of the University in the hands of its real instructors will be accepted.

A remarkable proof of this is given by the deliberations of another body, which the agitation of the last two years has called into existence. Those who know how completely the tutors are excluded from any power in the government of the University, have no doubt been surprised by seeing paragraphs, especially in the High Church newspapers, of the extreme activity with which the Oxford tutors have been engaged in maturing schemes of University Reform. A voluntary association of tutors has been formed, and has issued three reports.* The unknowing public has even been deluded, by the representations of the newspapers we have mentioned, into an idea that these tutors have some sort of power. They are, in fact, simply a debating society; and the subject of debate which they have lately selected has been University Reform. We are inclined to think that great good has arisen from these debates. By printing the results of their deliberations, the Tutors' Association have accustomed the minds of even the most obstructive masters of arts to the idea that some great changes are indispensable. In some points these tutors have gone beyond the Commissioners, and, especially, in this point of the changes requisite in the composition of the Hebdomadal Board. We strongly advise all who think that this governing body may be patched up in nearly its present state to peruse No. II. of the publications of the Tutors' Association; from which it appears that the tutors have resolved, not like the Commissioners, to remove the exclusive right of initiation possessed by the Hebdomadal Board, but utterly to annihilate that body and substitute another in its place, which bears no resemblance to it, except in meeting for the despatch of business once a week. They recommend that the new board, instead

* Reports of the Oxford Tutors' Association, No. I., No. II., No. III. Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1853.

of persons holding their power in virtue of their academical position, should consist of twenty-seven delegates, and that every year there should be a popular election. On the merits of this plan, as contrasted with that proposed for Oxford by the Commissioners, or with any other effectual scheme which may be devised, or on its connexion with the scheme of the Cambridge Report, we have no wish to enter. What we urge is, that, instead of modifying the power of the Oxford Heads, it deposes them altogether, taking away both their dignity and their privileges, and transferring both to another body; and that its publication ought to convince the Oxford Board, when they look at the names by which it is signed, that the change in their constitution which their committee has recommended to them will not give satisfaction even to the most conservative body of actual instructors in their University.

III. The third point on which the Government mean to insist is University Extension. At present, in both Universities, the existing colleges and halls enjoy an unfair monopoly: no student can be a member of the University who is not a member of one of these subordinate bodies. The consequence has been, as in all monopolies, that—competition being removed—these bodies have not felt themselves stimulated to improve their system, and expenses have risen very high. In Cambridge, as is well known, the good colleges have greatly extended themselves by allowing undergraduates to live in lodgings. But in Oxford, all undergraduates must pass three years within the limited space of the college walls. Consequently, the good colleges cannot accommodate any very large number of students; the result is, that the worst are sure of not being entirely deserted. Young men frequent them because they must. If a parent destines his son for holy orders he must send him to college. The natural tendency of this state of things is, that many persons who ought to have a university education are excluded. The whole scale of university expenses has become so high, that prudent fathers, even if they can afford the money, do not wish to expose their sons to the risk of contracting college habits of expense, unless actually compelled. Hence, with the exception of a certain proportion of intended barristers, young men destined to work their way in any profession other than the Church are scarcely ever sent to the University; and Oxford and Cambridge have lost much of their hold over the general body of intelligent men who are working in non-clerical professions. The number of barristers who receive a University education is diminishing: There are, we may say, no solicitors—no medical practitioners—

no engineers, bankers, or merchants — educated at Oxford or Cambridge.

Now, few will doubt that the right plan for curing many evils connected with this subject, is the abolition of that monopoly, to which so much of the inefficiency and expensiveness of the present system is owing. The Oxford Commissioners have proposed that colleges shall be allowed and encouraged greatly to extend their accommodation — that thus the bad colleges may be forced to improvement by entering into a fair competition with the good, instead of being, as at present, filled by those young men who are compelled to have recourse to them, because they cannot obtain admission elsewhere. They have proposed also, that every facility should be given for increasing this wholesome competition by allowing the foundation of new colleges and halls; and, lastly, they have recommended that young men, whose parents wish it, shall be allowed, under certain restrictions, to become students at the University, without the expense of belonging to any collegiate body.

Apprehensions were expressed in a former Number of our Review lest this last recommendation should be found to go too far. Much has been done, however, to recommend this plan by the Tutors' Association. This body has expressed the same apprehensions to which we formerly gave utterance, and which are very generally felt; but they seem to have discovered a way by which all such apprehensions may be dissipated. We believe that their recommendation on this subject, while differing in name from that of the Commissioners, against which the tutors protest somewhat strongly, is substantially the same; and the plan, as brought forward by the tutors, is certainly guarded against any danger of too unrestricted liberty. The Oxford Commissioners have recommended that young men may prosecute their studies at the University, living as economically as they please in private houses, and attending the instructions of university lecturers: but they have added (p. 52.): —

‘These students should be kept under due superintendence. Besides the control exercised over the lodging-house keepers by the University . . . such students would be as much amenable to University discipline as any others in the place, and in this respect their situation would be very different from that of medical and law students in London. . . . But, besides such means of control, we recommend that such lodging-houses should be placed under the special superintendence of University officers, to be constituted tutors or guardians of the University students. . . . Their duty would be, so far as the case permitted, to acquaint themselves with the character and circumstances of these students, and to take all means in their power for

exercising over them a due moral and religious superintendence. The University could easily arrange a system according to which such superintendence could be beneficially exercised, and it would not be difficult to find fellows of colleges who would take a lively interest in such an occupation.'

Perhaps sufficient prominence was hardly given in the Commissioners' Report to this passage, and the sentiments it contains. Certainly a good deal of misconception might have been dispelled had this superintendence been dwelt on more at large. The Association of Tutors seems to have overlooked the limitation which the Commissioners propose. Hence they speak as if they totally disapproved of this plan. But in reality they have adopted it. The Commissioners have said, 'the University could easily arrange a system according to which such superintendence' as they recommend to be entrusted to the tutors or guardian of these independent 'students could be beneficially exercised.' The Tutors' Association proposes that the guardians should reside in the same house with the pupils, and that the lodging house should be called a private hall. We presume there is no need to quarrel about a name; and residence in the same house will probably be a very good way of securing efficient superintendence. The Tutors' Association, speaking of the admission of such independent students, thus urges the case (No. I. p. 21.): —

'Other plans (for University Extension), desirable as we hold them to be, are simply extensions of colleges. This alone gives a place for the emulation of independent establishments. This alone would remove the exclusiveness, which would in some degree be the result of an education being limited to colleges—it would be the means of retaining some of our best teachers within the University' (i. e., they mean, heads of these independent establishments); 'it would stimulate our whole teaching by the competition of various classes; and while it would often meet the case of the extremely poor, it would be equally available for young men from the upper classes, whose friends might desire for them more complete domestic superintendence.'

The Committee of Heads of Houses have expressed their disapproval of this unrestricted competition; but they agree with the Tutors and the Commissioners in recommending that means should be taken to enable the existing colleges greatly to extend their accommodation and to associate with themselves halls which they may keep under their own management. This is one step in the right direction, though it cannot meet the wants of the case. We cannot look so favourably on their other proposal to spend 10,000*l.* of the University's money on the foundation of a new independent hall. Before

this expenditure is incurred, the public is entitled to demand that all the existing colleges and halls be made thoroughly useful, and that the Tutors' plan of private halls be tried, which would call for no wasteful outlay and might be contracted or expanded according to demand.

This subject of University Extension has an important bearing on the improvement of education generally throughout the land, and the establishment of that connexion which we anxiously hope for, between the systems of education for the several orders in the community. Every Government inspector will vouch for the fact, that many certificated masters of schools for the poor would be glad to improve their knowledge and their chances of advancement in life by studying at the University. It would be a great advantage if all masters of our middle schools were persons who had received a liberal education. Besides, it is most desirable that means should be opened up, by diminishing expenses, for the easy admission to Oxford and Cambridge of promising scholars from our lower schools. The plan thus sanctioned in substance, both by the Oxford Commissioners and the Oxford tutors, is the only right way to admit students of a lower class. Fellowships and scholarships have now become situations of influence and honour; it would be wrong to appoint men to these simply because they are poor. But thoroughly improve the Universities by such reforms as have been proposed; let the Universities be open to the poorest students, not by a forced system of charity, but if they are willing to fight their way; and let them know that, once in Oxford, they have before them the prospect of a free competition to 500 open fellowships, and improvement will soon work downwards: we should soon feel the stimulus in every school in the land.

IV. On the subject of the reorganisation of the professorial body—the fourth of the Government requirements—we never looked for many valuable internal suggestions, either from Oxford or Cambridge, except such as emanate from individuals. We could scarcely anticipate that either the Heads or the Tutors as a body should advocate any effectual Reform in this matter. Heads and Tutors, differing in so many other points, agree in their dislike of those who would prove rivals, with whom it would be very difficult to compete. The twenty-four Heads of Oxford would sink at once in social importance if confronted by twenty-four Professors chosen from the ablest men in the land, invested with sufficient University authority, and induced by sufficient endowments to make the University their home. The Tutors also would occupy a somewhat different po-

sition if their monopoly of instruction was abolished. We know both Heads and Tutors to be above any conscious jealousy of the Professors; but it is human nature to have an instinctive shrinking from innovations which necessarily imply a diminution of our own power as well as a very considerable alteration of the system under which we have long lived. Hence we are quite prepared for a determined resistance, in both quarters, to any extensive and energetic organisation of the professorial body.

To the Third Report of the Oxford Tutors' Association, indeed, while it strenuously and justly maintains the great value of the tutors' office, we are indebted for a clear statement, reduced in the Appendix to a table, of many great duties in the University, which require an efficient staff of thirty-three active professors. But an obvious feeling of alarm pervades the whole Report, lest these professors thus called into activity may become too powerful. Therefore the tutors' scheme, probably without their intending it, effectually guards against the professorships being usually filled by first-rate men. It is proposed that their emoluments should rarely exceed that moderate sum which a tutor now receives from his fellowship and tutorship, which will certainly not be enough to retain eminent men in the University for life; while a strenuous opposition is made to the very obvious plan which the Commissioners have suggested for training up fit candidates to fill the professorships as they become vacant, and no other plan is offered in its place.

That part of the Report of the Oxford Heads' Committee which treats of Professors is meagre and unsatisfactory in the extreme. This was only what was to be expected. In all that the Heads of Houses in Oxford have hitherto done for Professors, they have taken care, by the smallness of the stipends they have awarded, to guard against the establishment of any rivals near their own throne.* They are obviously not at all

* A very little matter often indicates the bent of men's thoughts. We cannot but think that one little suggestion (Report, p. 56.) well illustrates the view which the Committee of Heads takes of the Professor's office. They wish to meet the difficulty of raising a few hundred pounds to increase the present wretched stipends, and they have given a prominent place to this notable device. At present the Vice-Chancellor has six bedels to walk before him with maces on great occasions. They propose to reduce the number to two, and apply the wages of the other four to the endowment of Professorships. Why have they hesitated to suggest that, in order to mark their position, the Professors should themselves shoulder the maces and do the lictors' work?

aware of the great importance of securing first-rate instructors for the rising generation of students—men of real eminence, and who are willing to devote their lives to the pursuit of the studies they have selected. They form a low estimate of the sort of instruction necessary for undergraduates, and are quite contented with that very inferior teaching, which even the worst tutors of inferior colleges are found at present capable of imparting—men selected not from fitness for their calling, but because they are born in particular counties, or have been educated at particular schools. A story has been current in Oxford for many months which seems to show that this Committee of Heads is scarcely likely to take a very practical view of the present deficiency of the Professoriate. The only suggestion said to have been made on this subject by the most distinguished member of the Committee is, that there was certainly one professorship which it would be well to establish, viz., a Professorship of Chinese. Whether this suggestion was made seriously or in bitter irony, we cannot say. The proposer is not a man commonly supposed to be given to jesting: and he was evidently understood at the time to be serious by another Head, who, kindling at the thought of the expansiveness of his learned brother's soul, is said to have followed up the suggestion, by hinting that it would be well to have another professorship for the languages of Southern Africa. The Committee, on mature reflection, have been so pleased with the suggestion that to the astonishment of all who have been laughing at it for the last nine months, they have formally given the Chinese Professor a prominent place in their Report. We presume the learned Committee were of the opinion, that all branches of European learning are already so admirably taught in the University, that there is no room for improvement without seeking for the materials of progress in the very extremities of the earth. Not even the sacred cause of missions with which the Committee have connected it, ought to make us hesitate to stigmatise this Chinese proposition as an absurdity, while so many of our most obviously needful branches of learning are but ill taught.

But we have reason to believe that the nation in general has formed a different opinion of the perfection of the present University instruction. The Oxford Commissioners' Report has surely proved, that the University requires far abler instructors than it at present possesses—men of great reputation, who will therefore command the respect of their pupils—men of enthusiasm in the studies which they have selected as the business and pleasure of their lives—men who are contented to withdraw from the

rivalry of a profession and the bustle of life that they may give themselves to these studies, and have the high satisfaction of kindling a noble desire to pursue them amongst a generous youth — men who are the leaders of the thoughts of their fellow-men, each in his own branch of science. A galaxy of such men every great university ought to use every means to gather within its circle; but we look in vain for such men amongst the habitual teachers either of Oxford or Cambridge. Her Majesty's Commissioners have proposed to make the Professoriate a reality. They have endeavoured to answer the popular objections to professorial teaching. They have shown that the instruction of college tutors is not only at present notoriously deficient, but never can be made of itself sufficient to meet the wants of the University; indeed, that it will best perform its peculiar work, and become most perfect, when it goes side by side with the teaching of able professors. They have pointed out, moreover, the unreasonableness of those suspicions with which many look upon the teaching of professors, as likely to introduce German and other foreign modes of thought into our Universities.

'It is evident,' says the Oxford Commissioners' Report (p. 96.), 'on a more careful consideration of the subject, that an active system of professors would, in fact, be the best safeguard against such an evil. "I cannot help observing," says Professor Vaughan, "that such an apprehension appears to me hasty and ill-founded, and, indeed, if duly considered, the reverse of the truth. At the present moment the teaching of the University is, on the whole, indirectly determined (so far as the information itself is concerned) by the professorial system. Our classical manuals, editions, histories, grammars, &c. are the work of professors. These professors are foreigners; and, as we have no similar class in our own University, which might supply us, their superiority to our home-grown literature on such subjects is incontestable. The University is thus obliged to adopt the works of foreigners on many subjects; and with this is coupled the necessity of instilling in some degree their general principles of criticism and philosophy. Had we a professorial system of our own, embracing all the great subjects of instruction, the national character and genius would assert itself in their works. The spirit of our institutions, intellectual character, domestic life, and moral qualities, would necessarily be at work in the minds of our professors, to form a literature and philosophy independent, native, and in the truest and most valuable sense congenial: it would, therefore, not tend to make us copyists of foreign systems, either in form or spirit, but would open for us a new source of independence in these things."'

In this reading age undergraduates, of course, have their professors; but they are men uninfluenced by the feelings of English university-life. The intellectual influence of our universities is at this moment, in a great degree, wielded by foreign

writers, many of them of a very doubtful stamp. If young men cannot find instructors at home, they must seek them elsewhere; and, provided they find talent, they will not be very particular as to the tone in which the instruction is given.

The Commissioners proposed adequately to endow all the most important professorships. For this purpose they invoked the aid of Parliament. Both the Cambridge and Oxford Commissioners insist that fully adequate endowments for the purpose may be found in the revenues of the colleges without at all impairing their collegiate usefulness. It was proposed also to give to professors great weight in the government of the University, and to secure a succession of professors, by making university instruction a regular line of life, to which any man of literary ability may look for a livelihood. The professors ought to be assisted by a large body of sub-professors or lecturers, who will make the University their home, and teaching their life's business, not, as the tutors make it, a mere work by the way, which is to occupy them for a few years till they go off to a country living or the bar. This body of sub-professors will always afford the materials from which the greater professors can be chosen.

These sub-professors we regard as an indispensable part of a sound reform. The example of the richly-endowed Theological Faculty at Christ Church has in former times shown that, unless a new system be devised to supply candidates for the chairs as they become vacant, wealthy professorships may be mere sleeping-places. The office of University Instructor must become a profession; and a vigorous competition must urge all to the discharge of their duties. If one of the greater professors becomes unwilling or unable to fulfil his mission, he must find in the presence of these younger rivals, in the one case a stimulus to his exertions, in the other an abundant means of securing valuable aid. We trust that we shall see the proposed plan soon adopted for the establishment and adequate payment of a large staff of professors and sub-professors or public lecturers. Other reforms are indispensable for the better management of the academic machinery; but machinery, however well contrived, will be useless without a power to set it in motion; and to the professors and sub-professors of a new system we look for a great accession of intellectual life.

We will not weary our readers by showing more in detail how useful such a professorial system might be in Law, History, or Philosophy. But we must not altogether pass by Theology. The inert state of the Theological Faculty at Oxford is the strong hold of all who argue against the usefulness of a pro-

fessoriate. Certainly, as we have said, it is not want of endowments that has failed to secure here the desired result. Each of the Christ Church professorships is believed to be worth about 1,500*l.* a year. It would be wrong to speak otherwise than with respect of the learned and worthy men who at present hold these professorships, who are all conscientiously anxious to work; but something paralyses their efforts. There are doubtless other obstacles in the present system impeding their usefulness; but one great reason for their failure is, we believe, to be found in the fact, that they are not raised to their posts through such a vigorous competition as the Commissioners' scheme recommends. Indeed, it has sometimes happened, that men have been thrown into these situations as it were by mere accident, having had no training to fit them for the adequate discharge of their duties. Neither, as we have said, is there at present any provision for their being aided and stimulated by others, if in any department of their work they are found inefficient. The present wants of the Church call for the ablest, most earnest, and most influential instructors for the rising clergy. It is no injustice to the Divinity professors of Oxford, to say that, with the exception of Dr. Pusey, whom other reasons forbid us to praise, whatever ability and soundness they possess, not one of them has as yet succeeded in making his influence extensively felt. The time has passed when the Church can be satisfied with negative excellence. There are crises in society when what are called safe men are the most dangerous men in the world. We would not exclude such men from eminent posts in the University: it may even be right that they should hold the highest posts; but we protest against their having a monopoly of clerical instruction. There ought to be a fair-field and no favour. We repeat it — the most learned, able, and earnest religious men of the Church of England ought to be found amongst the instructors of its young clergy; and this cannot be effected without a much wider and freer competition than the present system allows.

Truly the Church of England requires at this moment a race of enlightened and energetic pastors, if it is rightly to fulfil its great work. We cannot conceive a more melancholy sight than that of a young clergyman from either University, trained in the present inefficient way — ordained as soon as he is of age — going down to some thickly-peopled district where he has to deal with intelligent mechanics, any one of whom is far more than his match in that sort of science which alone such persons appreciate, and far better acquainted than he is with the great social questions of the day. How will the young pastor's

knowledge of rubrics and a few antiquarian questions of theology enable him to grapple with Chartism and Socialism? Granted that there is a higher training required for a zealous pastor, which no University teaching can impart; but he does not gain from the University what we have a right to expect that it should give. Neither his meagre theology, nor his polite literature (of which probably, after all, if he is a young man of only average ability, he has a very slight sprinkling) will stand the shock of the unexpected conflict. Those whom the Church sends him to convince and instruct, have all the most powerful arguments against Christianity familiarly brought before them, from the cheap publications which retail to them the reasonings of Strauss and his school. But the young pastor knows neither the strength nor the weakness of such arguments; for the instructors at whose feet he has sat, have led him to suppose that they know as little on the subject as himself, usually teaching him to substitute a pious horror of all German books for a knowledge of their contents and a power of refuting their sophisms.

Would that the Church of England, the great bulwark in this age of Protestantism and of Christianity, knew its strength and the greatness of its mission. How goodly a foundation might the wholesome training of our Universities lay in a sound general education, if those who sit in their seats of honour would but raise the necessary superstructure. How far more powerful than any of the narrowly trained ministers of other denominations might the clergy of the Church of England be if the University did its duty by them. We do not deny that some of the young clergy are most intelligent and well read as well as zealous men; but these are so by their own efforts. The system of their University has given them no especial training for their work. We trust that not many months hence the professors, both of the theological and of every other faculty in our Universities, will be subjected to an unsparing reform.

But we weary our readers. The subject we have thought it right to bring forward is so comprehensive, that we must forbear. We will only once more express our confident hope that Lord John Russell's speech was the opening up of very thorough measures of educational improvement; and that the Government are now perfectly aware both of the magnitude of the task which lies before them, as bound to see that justice be done to all classes of the community in securing for them a good education, and also of the necessity for vigorous and speedy action in the accomplishment of this task. The poorest child in the streets and the son of the highest peer of the realm have

alike a right to demand that means be placed within their reach for learning in the best possible way to fulfil such duties as devolve on them in the body politic. And nothing will be found so effectual a cure for our social evils — nothing will, by God's blessing, so well unite the different parts of our social system and make them all work together for the country's good — as a vigorous determination on the part of our rulers to secure that it shall be their own fault if all are not well instructed and well trained. That statesman of our age will have the highest claim on the gratitude of posterity who shall have most forwarded the cause of an enlightened religious education in every class of rich and poor.

ART. VI.—1. *Vanity Fair: a Novel without a Hero.* By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. London: 1849.

2. *The History of Pendennis.* By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. London: 1849.

3. *The History of Henry Esmond, a Colonel in the Service of Her Majesty Queen Anne.* Written by himself. London: 1853.

4. *The English Humourists of the Eighteenth Century: a Series of Lectures.* By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. London: 1853.

WE had intended to review the whole of Mr. Thackeray's writings; but when we came to examine the twelve volumes which have been poured forth from the New York Press, and considered that they were only the forerunners of the three great novels which we have placed at the head of this Article, we felt that, if we attempted to criticise all, we must treat each superficially. We have resolved, therefore, to confine ourselves to the works on which Mr. Thackeray's fame really rests, and to leave Fitz-Boodle, and Barry Lyndon, and Men's Wives, and the Snobs, and the Yellow Plush Papers, and the Prize Novelists, and Mr. Brown's Letters, and Mr. Titmarsh's Travels, under the anonymous or pseudonymous veils in which their author thought fit to envelope them. We shall begin, therefore, with *Vanity Fair*.

We cannot tell what Mr. Thackeray's genius and diligence may still have in store for us; but of their numerous products up to the present time, *Vanity Fair* appears to us by far the best, the fullest of natural and amusing incident, and of characters with bold and firm outlines, and fine and con-

sistent details. It is called 'A Novel without a Hero;' and certainly, if a hero or a heroine be a person fitted to attract the affection or to rouse the admiration of the reader, if he or she is to be revered or to be adored, there is none such in *Vanity Fair*. There are, however, two marked figures which so far act the part of heroines as to be the props on which the whole tissue of the narrative is suspended, the centres which give to the plot the amount of unity which it possesses. These, of course, are Amelia and Becky. Their outward circumstances have much similarity. Each is born in middle life: they are educated at the same school; each marries, and, at the same time, a military man; each loses her husband, though not by similar causes, and is left with a single boy; each struggles with poverty; and each withdraws at the end of the story in affluence. An ordinary writer would have found it difficult to keep distinct characters so similar in their fortunes. In Mr. Thackeray's hands there the resemblance ends. In every other respect they are not merely different, but contrasted. One is the impersonation of virtue without intellect, the other that of intellect without virtue. One has no head, the other no heart.

Amelia Sedley is amiable by instinct. It is her nature to love all those with whom she comes in contact, just as it is the nature of a spaniel to caress every visitor. But her love, being founded on propinquity, not on judgment, is, like that of the spaniel, indiscriminating. She likes best those whom she has known longest, — her father, her mother, her husband, and her son, — and simply, as far as can be ascertained from their characters, *because* she has known them longest; for in themselves the first three are among the most unloveable specimens of this rich collection of deformities. The father is an ignorant, vulgar stock-broker, coarse and insolent in prosperity, and utterly beaten down by adversity. There are few passages in the work more highly finished than the interview between Sedley after his bankruptcy and his old *protégé* Captain Dobbin: —

"I am very glad to see you, Captain Dobbin, Sir," said he, after a skulking look or two at his visitor. "How is the worthy alderman, and my lady, your excellent mother, Sir?" He looked round at the waiter as he said, "my lady," as much as to say, Hark ye, John, I have friends still, and persons of rank and reputation too. "My wife will be very happy to see her ladyship. I've a very kind letter here from your father, Sir, and beg my respectful compliments to him. Lady D—— will find us in rather a smaller house than we were accustomed to receive our friends in; but it's snug, and the change of air does good to my daughter, who was suffering in town rather—"

you remember little Emmy, Sir? — Yes, suffering a good deal." The old gentleman's eyes were wandering as he spoke, and he was thinking of something else, as he sat thrumming on his papers and fumbling at the worn red tape.

"You're a military man," he went on; "I ask you, Bill Dobbin, could any man ever have speculated upon the return of that Corsican scoundrel from Elba? When the allied sovereigns were here last year, and we gave 'em that dinner in the city, Sir, and we saw the Temple of Concord, and the fireworks, and the Chinese bridge in St. James's Park, could any sensible man suppose that peace wasn't really concluded, after we'd actually sung *Te Deum* for it, Sir? I ask you, William, could I suppose that the Emperor of Austria was a damned traitor — a traitor, and nothing more? I don't mince words — a double-faced infernal traitor and schemer, who meant to have his son-in-law back all along. And I say that the escape of Boney from Elba was a damned imposition and plot, Sir, in which half the powers of Europe were concerned, to bring the funds down, and to ruin this country. That's why I'm here, William. That's why my name's in the Gazette. Why, Sir? — because I trusted the Emperor of Russia and the Prince Regent. Look here. Look at my papers. Look what the funds were on the 1st of March, — what the French fives were when I bought for the account, — and what they're at now. There was collusion, Sir, or that villain never would have escaped. Where was the English Commissioner who allowed him to get away? He ought to be shot, Sir, — brought to a court-martial, and shot, by Jove."

"We're going to hunt Boney out, Sir," Dobbin said, rather alarmed at the fury of the old man, the veins of whose forehead began to swell, and who sat drumming his papers with his clenched fist: "We are going to hunt him out, Sir, — the Duke's in Belgium already, and we expect marching orders every day."

"Give him no quarter. Bring back the villain's head, Sir. Shoot the coward down, Sir," Sedley roared. "I'd enlist myself, by —; but I'm a broken old man — ruined by that damned scoundrel — and by a parcel of swindling thieves in this country whom I made, Sir, and who are rolling in their carriages now." (Pp. 173, 174.)

Mr. Sedley is merely contemptible. His wife is equally contemptible, but, having a stronger will, is also odious. Mr. Thackeray has delightfully sketched her whole character in the scene in which she quarrels with Amelia for exclaiming that her child shall not be poisoned with Daffy's Elixir.

Mr. Thackeray adds:—

'Till the termination of her natural life, this breach between Mrs. Sedley and her daughter was never thoroughly mended. The quarrel gave the elder lady numberless advantages which she did not fail to turn to account with female ingenuity and perseverance. For instance, she scarcely spoke to Amelia for many weeks afterwards. She warned the domestics not to touch the child,

as Mrs. Osborne might be offended. She asked her daughter to see and satisfy herself that there was no poison prepared in the little daily messes that were concocted for Georgy. When neighbours asked after the boy's health, she referred them pointedly to Mrs. Osborne. She never ventured to ask whether the baby was well or not. *She* would not touch the child, although he was her grandson, and own precious darling, for she was not *used* to children and might kill it.' (P. 345.)

The person, however, who holds the first place in Amelia's heart is George Osborne, her husband. Mr. Thackeray has painted him at full length, with relentless truth and detail. He is first introduced to us as a young lieutenant, the accepted lover of Amelia, fond of her person, and pleased by her admiration, but ashamed of her family, and very much inclined to think that he is throwing himself away—that with his beauty and talents and expectations (his father is great in the tallow trade), he might aspire to something higher than a stock-broker's daughter. Then come three events simultaneously. He gets his company, Amelia is ruined, and she releases him from his engagement. He tries on his new uniform, and thinks *he* becomes him much; weeps over the trinkets and hair locket which she sends back to him; and tells Dobbin, with some despondency, that 'all is over between them.'

Dobbin, however, disapproves of his friend's easy acquiescence, carries him back to his betrothed, and never leaves him until the knot has been tied, and the new couple are on their road to Brighton.

One of the most powerful portraits in the work is that of old Osborne, George's father. If it have a defect, it is that it is too uniformly black. It is made up of arrogance, vanity, malignity, vindictiveness, ingratitude; in short, of all the bad passions and bad tendencies that are capable of coexistence. Of course he disapproves of the match, and notifies to George that he has nothing to expect, except what he cannot be deprived of, a couple of thousand pounds, his share of his mother's fortune.

These are the comments of the bridegroom in the first week of his honeymoon:—

"A pretty way you have managed the affair," said George, looking savagely at William Dobbin. "Look there, Dobbin," and he flung over to the latter his parent's letter. "A beggar, by Jove, and all in consequence of my d——d sentimentality. Why couldn't we have waited? A ball might have done for me in the course of the war, and may still, and how will Emmy be bettered by being left a beggar's widow? It was all your doing. You were never easy until you had got me married and ruined. What the deuce am I to

do with two thousand pounds? Such a sum won't last two years. I've lost a hundred and forty to Crawley at cards and billiards since I've been down here. A pretty manager of a man's matters *you* are, forsooth. Do you suppose a man of my habits can live on his pay and a hundred a year? How the deuce am I to keep up my position in the world upon such a pitiful pittance? I can't change my habits. I *must* have my comforts. I wasn't brought up on porridge like Mac Whirter, or on potatoes like old O'Dowd. Do you expect my wife to take in soldier's washing, or ride after the regiment in a baggage waggon?" (P. 211.)

The regiment is ordered abroad, and the scene changes to Brussels. George neglects his bride, wastes in a few weeks the little capital which was to have been her only support, tries to seduce her friend, hurries from the Duchess of Richmond's celebrated ball to Quatre Bras, and dies at Waterloo.

The amiable ridiculous character in the drama is Dobbin; and one of his absurdities is, that at first sight, and knowing that she is engaged to his friend George, he falls in love with Amelia. Year after year, during her widowhood, he urges his suit—but in vain. Her heart is filled by the recollection of 'that departed saint,' her husband. At length it suits Becky that Amelia should marry, and thus she effects her purpose.

"Listen to me, Amelia," said Becky, marching up and down the room before the other, and surveying her with a sort of contemptuous kindness. "I want to talk to you. You are no more fit to live in the world than a baby in arms. You must marry, or you and your precious boy will go to ruin—you must have a husband, you fool; and one of the best gentlemen I ever saw has offered to you a hundred times."

"I tried —, I tried my best, indeed I did, Rebecca," said Amelia deprecatingly, "but I could not forget —," and she looked up at George's portrait.

"Could not forget him," cried Becky; "that selfish humbug, that low-bred cockney dandy, that padded booby, who had neither wit, nor manners, nor heart. —Why, the man would have jilted you, but that Dobbin made him keep his word. He never cared for you. He used to sneer about you to me time after time, and made love to me the week after he married you."

"It's false! It's false!" said Amelia, starting up.

"Look there, you fool," Becky said, still with provoking good humour, and taking a little paper out of her belt flung it into Amelia's lap. "You know his hand-writing; he wrote that to me, — wanted me to run away with him, — gave it to me under your nose the day before he was shot, — and served him right," Becky repeated. (Pp. 618, 619.)

Amelia, as usual, obeys, and marries Dobbin a week after. Amelia's boy is one of the least marked characters. Indeed

it is difficult to make a child attractive, except in tragedy. Mamilius, Arthur, Edward the Fifth, and his brother affect us, but it is because we contrast their happy childish prattle with the dark fate that is soon to swallow them up. If they had been destined to a long and happy life, we should have been wearied by them. Again, the youth of a very remarkable man, of Rousseau, for instance, or of Scuthey, is instructive, both as it shows the dawn of an intellect that was to shine so brightly, and as it enables us to trace many of the moral excellences and defects of the adult to the training of the child. But this can be done only in an autobiography. Such a narrative loses its merit with its reality. Who can read the *Emile*?

Now as little Osborne was intended for wealth and prosperity, he could not be made interesting by contrast, and Mr. Thackeray has prudently sketched him in rather indistinct colours, as a handsome, commonplace, spoiled boy, likely when he should come of age to spend a fortune, but certainly not to earn one.

Such are the objects of Amelia's affections. As to her actions, few of them are really hers. She generally obeys, without preference and without reluctance, the impulse given to her by those immediately around her. In obedience to her parents she falls in love with George Osborne; by her father's orders she dismisses him; at her mother's bidding she resumes him. The only act in which she exhibits free-will is the surrender of her son to his grandfather. The struggle which she goes through, the feelings which alternately impel and restrain her, are described with exquisite skill.

The evils and the dangers of such a surrender were scarcely capable of exaggeration. To give up a child of ten years old to the absolute management of a stranger is a frightful risk, even if that stranger were a Fenelon. To give it up to a coarse, uneducated, violent old man; to expose it to be crushed by his tyranny, and spoiled by his indulgence; to throw into its path the temptations of both wealth and poverty, those which rouse into insolence, and those which degrade into servility—these are chances from which a sensible mother would have recoiled. No hopes of wealth or grandeur; no fears, except that of absolute starvation, would have induced her to incur them.

But these are *not* the motives which influence Amelia. They do not even occur to her:—as far as the boy is concerned, she sees nothing in Mr. Osborne's offers but wealth, station, and education. Yet she rejects those offers with indignation.

'She was never,' says our author, 'seen angry but twice or thrice in her life, and it was in one of these moods that Mr. Osborne's attorney had the good fortune to behold her. She rose up trembling and flushing, and tore the letter into a hundred fragments. "I take money to part from my child! Who dares insult me by proposing such a thing? Tell Mr. Osborne that it is a cowardly letter, Sir, — a cowardly letter; — I will not answer it. — I wish you good morning, Sir," — and she bowed me out of the room like a tragedy queen, said the lawyer who told the story.' (P. 413.)

The cause of all this anger is simply the selfish feeling that she cannot bear to lose the society of her son. Poverty, however, comes on her like an armed man; every resource fails, and she 'tries in vain to hide from herself the thought which will return to her, that she ought to part with the boy, that she is the only barrier between him and prosperity. She can't, she can't, — not now at least. Oh, it is too hard to think of and to bear.' (P. 442.)

At length she submits. 'The sentence is passed, — the child must go from her to others, — to forget her. Her heart, her treasure, — her hope, joy, love, worship, — she must give him up.' (P. 443.)

The boy is given over to his grandfather; but some of the evils that were to be expected do not follow. Old Osborne has become somewhat mellowed by age and infirmity. Georgy suffers not from his severity, but from his fondness. Every stimulant is applied to his vanity, his imperiousness, and his self-indulgence. 'How he du damn and swear,' the servants say, delighted by his precocity. He grows up domineering, conceited, and selfish. But the feebleness of mind which prevented his mother's anticipating these results, prevents her perceiving them. She believes him to be perfect, or, what in her eyes is the same, to be his father over again.

The reader will have inferred, from the attention which we have paid to the character of Amelia, that we think it a creation of extraordinary skill. We do so. It appears to us to unite the two greatest merits that a fictitious character can possess, — originality and nature. And yet it is the source of one of the greatest blemishes of the work. Mr. Thackeray indulges in the bad practice of commenting on the conduct of his *dramatis personæ*. He is perpetually pointing out to us the generosity of Dobbin, the brutality of the Osbornes, the vanity of Joseph Sedley, and so on, instead of leaving us to find out their qualities from their actions. And in the course of this running commentary he keeps repeating that Amelia was adorable; that she was the idol of all who approached her, and deserved to be

so ; in short, that she was the perfection of womanhood. Now we will not deny that she had qualities which would make her agreeable as a plaything, and useful as a slave ; but playthings or slaves are not what men look for in wives. They want partners of their cares, counsellors in their perplexities, aids in their enterprises, and companions in their pursuits. To represent a pretty face, an affectionate disposition, and a weak intellect as together constituting the most attractive of women, is a libel on both sexes.

We must now take up Amelia's pendant, Becky : the character, among all that Mr. Thackeray has drawn, which has received the most applause.

When we said that she was the impersonation of intellect without virtue, we used the word virtue in perhaps too narrow a sense, as indicating the qualities which we love, the qualities which arise from the sympathy of their possessor with others, and therefore occasion *them* to sympathise with him. Now, of these qualities Becky is devoid. She has no affection, no pity, no disinterested benevolence. She is indeed perfectly selfish. She wants all the virtues which are to be exercised for the benefit of others. She has neither justice nor veracity. She treats mankind as mankind treats the brutes, as mere sources of utility or amusement, as instruments, or playthings, or prey. But many of the self-regarding virtues she possesses in a high degree. She has great industry, prudence, decision, courage, and self-reliance. These are the qualities which, when under the direction of a powerful intellect, unbiassed by sympathies, and unrestrained by scruples, have produced many of the masters of mankind. In a higher sphere Becky might have been a Semiramis or a Catherine. As might be expected in a person of her good sense and self-control, she is mistress of the smaller virtues, good temper and good nature ; she always wishes to please, because it is only by pleasing that she can subjugate. She is not resentful or spiteful, because she despises those around her too much to waste anger on them, and because she knows that petty injuries are generally repaid with interest. Her estimate of herself is not far from the truth. She is visiting at a sober country-house, in which she formerly lived as a governess.

' One day followed another, and the ladies of the house passed their life in those calm pursuits and amusements which satisfy country ladies. Rebecca sung Handel and Haydn to the family of evenings, and engaged in a large piece of worsted work, as if she had been born to the business, and as if this kind of life was to continue with her until she should sink to the grave in a polite old age, leaving regrets

and a great quantity of consols behind her, — as if there were not cares and duns, schemes, shifts, and poverty waiting outside the Park gates to pounce upon her when she issued into the world again.

“It isn't difficult to be a country gentleman's wife,” Rebecca thought; “I think I could be a good woman if I had five thousand a-year. I could dawdle about in the nursery, and count the apricots on the wall. I could water plants in a green-house, and pick off dead leaves from the geraniums; I could ask old women about their rheumatisms, and order half-a-crown's worth of soup for the poor; I shouldn't miss it much out of five thousand a-year. I could go to church and keep awake in the great family pew: or go to sleep behind the curtains, and with my veil down, if I only had practice. I could pay everybody if I had but the money.”

“The old haunts, the old fields and woods, the copses, ponds, and gardens, the rooms of the old house where she had spent a couple of years seven years ago, were all carefully revisited by her. She had been young then, or comparatively so, for she forgot the time when she ever *was* young, — but she remembered her thoughts and feelings seven years back, and contrasted them with those which she had at present, now that she had seen the world and lived with great people, and raised herself far beyond her original humble station.

“I have passed beyond it because I have brains,” Becky thought, “and almost all the rest of the world are fools. I could not go back and consort with those people now, whom I used to meet in my father's studio. Lords come up to my door with stars and garters, instead of poor artists with screws of tobacco in their pockets. I have a gentleman for my husband, and an Earl's daughter for my sister, in the very house where I was little better than a servant a few years ago. But am I much better to do now in the world than I was when I was the poor painter's daughter, and wheedled the grocer round the corner for sugar and tea? Suppose I had married Francis, who was so fond of me, I couldn't have been much poorer than I am now. Heigho! I wish I could exchange my position in society, and all my relations for a snug run in the three per cent. consols.” For so it was that Becky felt the Vanity of human affairs, and it was in those securities that she would have liked to cast anchor.’ (Pp. 376, 377.)

The game which poor Becky plays is, from its outset, almost a hopeless one: it is, to rise in the world without money, or birth, or connexions, or friends. She begins it at seventeen; the orphan, penniless daughter of a drunken, unsuccessful painter and a French opera girl. Received as a French teacher in Miss Pinkerton's school, bored by the pompous vanity of the mistress, the silly chat and scandal and quarrels of the girls, and the frigid, empty correctness of the governesses, she forms her habits of unsympathising self-existence. She fights her way to be a governess in Sir Pitt Crawley's family; and, by a mixture of wheedling, coaxing, flattering, and rallying (described with as much humour as it is conceived), hooks and plays with, and at

length lands, her first spoil, Captain Rawdon Crawley. Her prize, however, resembles the gold paid by the magician in the *Arabian Nights*, which turned to leaves in the receiver's purse. Crawley's aunt, disgusted by his match, burns a will under which he was to have inherited 50,000*l.*; and Becky finds that all that she has gained is a good-natured husband, overwhelmed with debt, with no property but his commission in the Life Guards, and no knowledge except of whist, piquette, and billiards. With her usual good sense, she makes the most of her unpromising cards—goes with the regiment to Brussels—turns the general commanding the division into her slave—provides victims for the admirable play of her husband—and makes him the happiest of mortals.

'She had mastered this rude coarse nature, and he loved and worshipped her with all his faculties of regard and admiration. In all his life he had never been so happy as, during the past few months, his wife had made him. She had known perpetually how to divert him, and he had found his house and her society a thousand times more pleasant than any place or company which he had ever frequented from his childhood until now. And he cursed his past follies and extravagances, and bemoaned his vast outlying debts, which must remain for ever as obstacles to prevent his wife's advance.

'Rebecca always knew how to conjure away these moods of melancholy. "Why, my stupid love," she would say, "we have not done with your aunt yet. If she fails us, isn't there what you call the Gazette? or, stop, when your uncle Bute's life drops, I have another scheme. The living always belonged to the youngest brother, and why shouldn't you sell out and go into the Church?" The idea of this conversion set Rawdon into roars of laughter; you might have heard the explosion through the hotel at midnight. General Tufts heard it from his quarters in the first floor; and Rebecca acted the scene with great spirit, and preached Rawdon's first sermon, to the immense delight of the General at breakfast.' (Pp. 258, 259.)

The night before *Quatre Bras* comes. Three partings are described. The first is that between Amelia and George Osborne.

'On arriving at his quarters from the ball, George found his regimental servant already making preparations for his departure; the man had understood his signal to be still, and these arrangements were very quickly and silently made. Should he go in and wake Amelia, he thought, or leave a note for her brother to break the news of departure to her? He went to look at her once again.

'She had been awake when he first entered her room, but had kept her eyes closed, so that even her wakefulness should not seem to reproach him. But when he had returned, so soon after herself, too, this timid little heart had felt more at ease, and, turning towards him as he slept softly out of the room, she had fallen into a light sleep.

'He came to the bed-side, and looked at the hand, the little soft hand, lying asleep: and he bent over the pillow noiselessly towards the gentle pale face.

'Two fair arms closed tenderly round his neck as he stooped down. "I am awake, George," the poor child said, with a sob fit to break the little heart that nestled so closely by his own. She was awake, poor soul, and to what? At that moment a bugle from the Place of Arms began sounding clearly, and was taken up through the town; and amidst the drums of the infantry, and the shrill pipes of the Scotch, the whole city awoke.' (P. 256.)

The next is between Major O'Dowd, who commands the regiment, and his wife.

"'I'd like ye wake me about half an hour before the assembly beats," the Major said to his lady. "Call me at half-past one, Peggy, dear, and see me things is ready. May be I'll not come back to breakfast, Mrs. O'D." With which words, the Major ceased talking, and fell asleep.

'Mrs. O'Dowd, the good housewife, arrayed in curl papers and a camisole, felt that her duty was to act, and not to sleep, at this juncture. "Time enough for that," she said, "when Mick's gone;" and so she packed his travelling-valise ready for the march, brushed his cloak, his cap, and other warlike habiliments, set them out in order for him; and stowed away in the cloak pockets a light package of portable refreshments, and a wicker covered flask or pocket-pistol, containing near a pint of a remarkably sound Cognac brandy, of which she and the Major approved very much, and as soon as the hands of the "repythier" pointed to half-past one, and its interior arrangements (it had a tone quite equal to a cathay-dral its fair owner considered) knelled forth that fatal hour, Mrs. O'Dowd woke up her Major, and had as comfortable a cup of coffee prepared for him as any made that morning in Brussels.' (Pp. 257, 258.)

Last comes that of the Crawleys.

'Rebecca, as we have said, wisely determined not to give way to unavailing sentimentality on her husband's departure. She waved him an adieu from the window, and stood there for a moment looking out after he was gone. The cathedral towers and the full gables of the quaint old houses were just beginning to blush in the sunrise. There had been no rest for her that night. She was still in her pretty ball dress, her fair hair hanging somewhat out of curl on her neck, and the circles round her eyes dark with watching. "What a fright I seem," she said, examining herself in the glass, "and how pale this pink makes one look!" So she divested herself of this pink raiment; in doing which a note fell out from her corsage, which she picked up with a smile, and locked into her dressing-box. And then she put her bouquet of the ball into a glass of water, and went to bed, and slept very comfortably.

'The town was quite quiet when she woke up at ten o'clock, and

partook of coffee, very requisite and comfortable after the exhaustion and grief of the morning's occurrences.

'This meal over, she surveyed her position. Should the worst befall, all things considered, she was pretty well to do. There were her own trinkets and trousseau, in addition to those which her husband had left behind. Besides these, and the little mare, the General, her slave and worshipper, had made her many very handsome presents, in the shape of cashmere shawls bought at the auction of a bankrupt French general's lady, and numerous tributes from the jewellers' shops, all of which betokened her admirer's taste and wealth.

'Every calculation made of these valuables, Mrs. Rebecca found, not without a pungent feeling of triumph and self-satisfaction, that should circumstances occur, she might reckon on six or seven hundred pounds, at the very least, to begin the world with: and she passed the morning disposing, ordering, looking out, and locking up her properties in the most agreeable manner. If this is a novel without a hero, at least let us lay claim to a heroine. No man in the British army which has marched away, not the great duke himself, could be more cool or collected in the presence of doubts and difficulties, than the indomitable little aide-de-camp's wife.' (Pp. 260, 261, 262.)

In a year or two we find Becky in London, having achieved the perilous enterprise of scaling the heights of fashion; but she finds them neither secure nor amusing.

'Becky's former acquaintances hated and envied her: the poor woman herself was yawning in spirit. "I wish I were out of it," she said to herself. "I would rather be a parson's wife, and teach a Sunday School, than this; or a sergeant's lady and ride in the regimental waggon; or O! how much gayer it would be to wear spingales and trousers, and dance before a booth at a fair."

' "You would do it very well," said Lord Steyne, laughing. She used to tell the great man her *ennuis* and perplexities in her artless way—they amused him.

'In her commerce with the great, our dear friend showed the same frankness which distinguished her transactions with the lowly in station. On one occasion, when out at a very fine house, Rebecca was (perhaps rather ostentatiously) holding a conversation in the French language with a celebrated tenor singer of that nation, while the Lady Grizzel Macbeth looked over her shoulder scowling at the pair.

' "How very well you speak French," Lady Grizzel said, who herself spoke the tongue in an Edinburgh accent most remarkable to hear. "I ought to know it," Becky modestly said, casting down her eyes. "I taught it in a school, and my mother was a Frenchwoman."

'Lady Grizzel was won by her humility, and was mollified towards the little woman. She deplored the fatal levelling tendencies of the age, which admitted persons of all classes into the society of

their superiors; but her ladyship owned, that this one at least was well behaved, and never forgot her place in life.

'How the Crawleys got the money which was spent upon the entertainments with which they treated the polite world, was a mystery which gave rise to some conversation at the time, and probably added zest to these little festivities. Who knows what stories were or were not told of our dear and innocent friend? Certain it is, that if she had had all the money which she was said to have begged, or borrowed, or stolen, she might have capitalised and been honest for life, whereas,—but this is advancing matters. The truth is, that by economy and good management—by a sparing use of ready money, and by paying scarcely anybody—people can manage, for a time at least, to make a great show with very little means: and it is our belief, that Becky's much-talked-of parties, which were not, after all that was said, very numerous, cost this lady very little more than the wax candles which lighted the walls. Stillbrook supplied her with game and fruit in abundance. Lord Steyne's cellar was at her disposal, and that excellent nobleman's famous cooks presided over her little kitchen, or sent by my lord's order the rarest delicacies from their own. I protest it is quite shameful in the world to abuse a simple creature, as people of her time abuse Becky, and I warn the public against believing one-tenth of the stories against her.' (Pp. 453, 454, 455.)

If Becky could have changed sexes with her husband, all would have gone well. She might have canvassed a borough as a Radical, and a county as a Tory—might have gained the ear of the House by malignity, and kept it by effrontery—might have risen into notoriety by attacking the first men of the age, and have become the leader of a party by joining one which all persons of sense had deserted. But she is a woman; she can establish herself only through her husband; and her husband has neither talents, nor knowledge, nor character. Her only resource is to treat him as damaged goods generally are treated—to export him to the colonies. It is an awful job; but her friend Lord Steyne is all-powerful. Such things, however, are not to be got for nothing, and poor Becky has only one means of paying for them.

Unhappily, on the very night that the gazette is being printed which announces that His Majesty has been pleased to appoint Colonel Crawley, C.B., to be the Governor of Coventry Island, Crawley discovers what was the nature of the contract by which his preferment was obtained. He knocks down his patron, publishes his wife's shame, separates himself from her for ever, and goes out to administer Swamp Town.

Mr. Thackeray has not made Becky's downward course as entertaining as her rise. Indeed, it was impossible. No series of events can amuse, or, what is a much easier thing, can interest,

unless we can sympathise in some respects with the principal agent. Even in tragedy, the most atrocious villain is generally invested by the poet with some qualities which we admire and even love. Richard the Third, Iago, and Lovelace, perhaps the most hateful of poetical heroes, possess in the highest degree wit, sagacity, courage, and decision. Tears, such as angels weep, burst forth from Satan. Now, in Becky's earlier career, though there was more to hate, there was much to admire, and something to like. The reader thoroughly sympathised with her scorn of fools, however highly placed; with the intrepidity with which she encountered insolence, and the dexterity with which she repelled it; with her spirit in danger, her resources in difficulty, and the gay vivacity which was spread like sunshine over her whole demeanour. He was amused even by the impudence of her vanity, and the breadth and boldness of her mendacity. It is difficult to avoid sympathising with the success of schemes so magnificently planned and so audaciously carried out. It is not Fortune alone that favours the bold. All the world follows Fortune's example.

But with her success all the charm of Becky disappears. Even Mr. Thackeray turns his back upon her. He no longer supplies her with the sagacity and presence of mind which carried her triumphantly through the storms and among the quicksands of her London life. He allows her to sink from degradation to degradation, without an effort on his part, or even on hers, to extricate her, until she loses her identity, and the brilliant Rebecca turns into a vulgar swindler. At length, he seems to relent, and to take pity on the distresses of an old acquaintance who has afforded so much amusement. He throws Amelia and her brother across her path, and gives up to her the rich Joseph as a prey. And here we think her changes ought to have ended. As the ruler, and, as soon as the climate of Coventry Island rendered her a widow, the wife, of Joseph Sedley, she might have passed the tranquil, decorous middle age to which he at length dismisses her, — 'busied in works of piety; going to church, and never without a footman; the subscriber to every charity; the fast friend of the destitute orange girl, the neglected washerwoman, and the distressed muffinman; a patroness and stall-keeper in every benevolent bazaar in Cheltenham and Bath.' Instead of this, he blackens her with the vulgar commonplace crimes of making Sedley's will in her favour, insuring his life, and poisoning him.

This we venture to think a mistake. Comic characters are intended to amuse, not to frighten. They may be as vicious as the author pleases; they may be utterly heartless, they may

swindle, they may rob; but they must not kill. The extent to which tragi-comedy is allowable may be undefined; but this we think is clear, namely, that the comedy must be an accessory to the tragedy, not the tragedy to the comedy. The intermixture of a few cheerful spots among gloomy or frightful scenes is felt as a relief. The intrusion of the terrible among gay images is an interruption. It is like a gibbet as the background of a Watteau. We are pleased to enjoy a respite from the continued contemplation of suffering or danger. We are shocked at being disturbed in our laughter by wailings and screams. All Shakspeare's tragedies have a mixture of comedy; none of his comedies contain any thing that is tragic. Hotspur, Henry the Fifth, and Richard are tragic. Their powers for good and for evil are gigantic; the fate of kingdoms depends on them. They can afford to trifle; their wit and humour, though sometimes pushed to buffoonery, does not lower them. Richard may smile, because he can murder while he smiles. But what should we think of Shakspeare if he had made Falstaff an assassin, or had engaged Shallow, Slender, and Poins in a murderous conspiracy? Hatred is to most men a painful emotion. There are undoubtedly torpid dispositions which require strong excitement, which enjoy pictures of murderers, tyrants, and oppressors just as they enjoy the taste of garlic, and the smell of tobacco; but these coarse intellectual palates are rare. In most minds the indignation produced by the description of great crimes requires to be soothed by the exemplary punishment of the offender, or to be diverted by withdrawing from him the reader's attention, and fixing it on the heroism of the sufferer, on the courage with which he resists violence, or on the patience with which he bears it. But these are the materials of tragedy; and when they are introduced into a work of which the basis is comic, they recall us painfully from the sunny scenes among which we have been wandering to the gloomy regions of danger and endurance.

Though we have left more than half the characters in *Vanity Fair* unnoticed, our review of it has extended to almost an unwarrantable length. Our defence is, that we have been reviewing one of the most remarkable books of this age—a work which is as sure of immortality as ninety-nine hundredths of modern novels are sure of annihilation.

Pendennis has generally been thought inferior to *Vanity Fair*, and we are not inclined to dispute the verdict of the public. It wants the grand historical background of *Vanity Fair*. Mr. Thackeray never was more happily inspired than when he removed his theatre to Belgium. Every reader will admit that

the events in Brussels are those which are the most strongly imprinted on his memory. Every one recollects, as well as if he had witnessed them, the perplexities of Lady Bareacres, the undaunted self-possession of Becky, and the terrors of Joseph Sedley. But it is not merely to the exquisite truth with which these scenes are imagined that they owe their apparent reality. The solid foundation of fact by which all that is invention is supported, gives to it a stability which no pure fictions can possess. We know that thousands must have been startled at their mid-day meal, like Sedley and Mrs. O'Dowd by the dull distant mutterings of *Quatre Bras*. We know that tens of thousands felt Amelia's terrors when the cannon of Waterloo began to roar. Every Scotchman who visited the British Institution last year, and admired Drummond's charming picture of John Knox bringing home his second wife, felt what probability was given to its imaginary details by the curious gable ends and projecting windows and outside staircase of the still existing house at the head of the Netherbow, which the serious bridal procession is reaching.

It has been objected to the historical novel that it carries untruth on the face of it. First, because we already know all that can be known of the departed great, and feel that any additional actions or speeches must be attributed to them falsely. And secondly, because the reader has always formed to himself a conception of the language and conduct of every historical person in whom he is interested, and is disgusted when the author's conception of them differs, as it almost always must, from his own.

There is much foundation for these objections, and Mr. Thackeray, in *Vanity Fair*, has skilfully avoided them, by excluding from his novel historical characters, though he admits historical events. He has not given us a sketch, or even a side view, of any actor in the great drama of 1815, whose name was ever heard of before. Isidor and Pauline, and the O'Dowds and Regulus, are all the delightful creations of the author. But we know that there must have been such persons in Brussels in June 1815, that they must have witnessed the wonders of that memorable month, and that they must have talked and acted in the same manner, though not quite so amusingly, as their representatives are made to do in the pages of *Vanity Fair*. Now all this is wanting in *Pendennis*. As far as can be inferred from any historical allusions, it might have been written at any time during the present, or indeed during the last century. The old and the young, the Londoners and the provincials, all act and talk as if the fortunes of the country had no con-

nexion with theirs. Even the professional writers deal with politics with the impartiality of indifference. They put one in mind of Chatterton's computation on a great man's death. 'Lost by not being able to dedicate to him, ten guineas. 'Gained by writing his life, 12*l*. Am glad he is dead, by 'thirty shillings.'

Pendennis is further distinguished from *Vanity Fair* by possessing a hero. Arthur Pendennis, who fills that office, is the only child of a retired apothecary, of an old but reduced family. He loses his father at sixteen, and from that time is educated, or rather supported, under the care of a weak, affectionate mother, one of the tender, generous incapables whom Mr. Thackeray delights in painting, because he paints them well. He lives at home with her and a nominal tutor; falls in love with an actress, who jilts him when she finds that he has nothing in possession, and only 500*l*. a year in prospect; and is removed to the University, where he becomes a fast young man, runs in debt, and is plucked. He retires to his native village, lives idly with his mother and his cousin (the good heroine of the piece), after some love passages, takes refuge in the Temple as a law-student, is disgusted by the study, and adopts literature as a profession. He succeeds as a magazine writer, novelist, and minor poet; and partly as a *littérateur*, and partly through the patronage of his uncle, an antiquated beau, gets admission into the world of fashion. His mother's death puts him in possession of his patrimony, and after some more abortive love-making he marries his cousin, and settles in the country.

Along this not very interesting biography is strung a garland of portraits and incidents, conceived with Mr. Thackeray's wonderful fertility of invention, and executed with his equally wonderful mastery of outline and colour.

One of the most amusing of these portraits is the actress, Pendennis's juvenile flame — Miss Costigan, or, to use her *nom de théâtre*, the Fotheringay. Mr. Thackeray gives to her a splendid person,—after the model of Gibson's *Puella Capuana*, whom indeed she resembles intellectually,—industry, good sense, and good tendencies, but absolutely no imagination, and therefore the torpidity of feeling which generally follows from that defect. She has taken to the stage as the best means of supporting herself and her drunken Irish father; accepts blindly the instructions of one Bows, a clever dramatic teacher, the leader of the orchestra; practises them with unremitting diligence, and becomes, in the parts which she has thus studied, a fine actress from pure memory. The courtship is eminently

entertaining; but still more so its conclusion, when Captain Costigan discovers and exposes to his daughter the real circumstances of Pendennis.

The interlocutors are the father and daughter and Bows, a hump-backed little old man, who, it must be recollected, is himself in love with the Fotheringay.

"O Emilee!" cried the Captain, "that boy whom I loved as the boy of mee bosom is only a scoundthrel, and a deceiver, mee poor girl:" and he looked in the most tragical way at Mr. Bows, opposite; who, in his turn, gazed somewhat anxiously at Miss Costigan.

"He! pooh! Sure the poor lad's as simple as a schoolboy," she said. "All them children write verses and nonsense."

"He's been acting the part of a viper to this fireside, and a traitor in this familie," cried the Captain. "I tell ye he's no better then an impostor."

"What has the poor fellow done, papa?" asked Emily.

"Done? He has deceived me in the most atrocious manner," Miss Emily's papa said. "He has trifled with your affections, and outraged my own fine feelings. He has represented himself as a man of property, and it tuoruns out that he is no better than a beggar. Haven't I often told ye he had two thousand a year? He's a pauper, I tell ye, Miss Costigan: a dependant upon the bountee of his mother, a good woman, who may marry again, who's likely to live for ever, and who has but five hundred a year."

"Milly looked very grave and thoughtful, rubbing with bread crumb a pair of ex-white satin shoes, intending to go mad upon them next Tuesday in Ophelia. "Sure if he's no money, there's no use marrying him, papa," she said sententially.

"Why did the villain say he was a man of prawpertee?" asked Costigan.

"The poor fellow always said he was poor," answered the girl. "'Twas you would have it he was rich, papa,—and made me agree to take him."

"He should have been explicit and told us his income, Milly," answered the father. "A young fellow who rides a blood mare, and makes presents of shawls and bracelets, is an impostor if he has no money."

"And so poor Arthur has no money?" sighed out Miss Costigan, rather plaintively. "Poor lad, he was a good lad too: wild and talking nonsense, with his verses and pothry and that, but a brave, generous boy, and indeed I liked him — and he liked me too," she added, rather softly, and rubbing away at the shoe.

"Why don't you marry him if you like him so?" Mr. Bows said, rather savagely. "He is not more than ten years younger than you are. His mother may relent, and you might go and live and have enough at Fair Oaks Park. Why not go and be a lady? I could go on with the fiddle, and the General live on his half-pay. Why don't you marry him? You know he likes you."

"There's others that likes me as well, Bows, that has no money, and that's old enough," Miss Milly said.

"Yes, d—— it," said Bows, with a bitter curse — "that are old enough and poor enough and fools enough for anything."

"There's old fools, and young fools too. You've often said so, you silly man," the imperious beauty said, with a conscious glance at the old gentleman. "If Pendennis has not enough money to live upon, it's folly to talk about marrying him: and that's the long and short of it." (Vol. i. pp. 109, 110, 111.)

The contrast between the humdrum Miss Costigan and the impassioned Fotheringay is most amusing; but in justice to the charming profession to which she belongs, we feel bound to express some doubt whether really fine acting can be the result of mere memory and unintelligent imitation. There are indeed great authorities in Mr. Thackeray's favour. Johnson said of Pritchard, that she was a vulgar idiot, that her playing was quite mechanical, and that she no more thought of reading the play out of which her part was taken than a shoemaker thinks of the skin out of which the piece of leather of which he is making a pair of shoes is cut. And Diderot has written an essay to prove that perfect self-possession and cold insensibility to the emotions which he represents are essential to a great actor. 'Such an actor,' he says, 'is the same in every representation, and always equally perfect. All is prepared, all is learned by heart. His passion has its beginning, its middle, and its end. The same accents, the same positions, the same gestures are repeated. If there be any difference, the last representation, being the most studied, is the best. 'You ask me,' he continues, 'whether these plaintive tones, these half-stifled sobs, in which a despairing mother seems to pour forth her inmost soul, can be the result of no real emotion? Unquestionably, I answer; and the proof is, that they form part of a system of declamation—that they have been elaborated by long study—that to be properly uttered they have been repeated a hundred times—that every time the actor listened to his own voice—that he is listening to it now—and that his skill consists not in feeling an emotion, but in imitating its external signs. Those screams of grief are noted in his memory; those gestures of despair have been laboriously prepared. He has fixed in his own mind the precise time when he is to weep. This trembling voice, these half-uttered, half-stifled words, these quivering limbs, these trembling knees—all is pure memory, a lesson carefully learned and accurately repeated; a sublime deception, which the actor knows to be a deception while he is executing it; which wearies his

'body, but does not disturb his mind.'—*Correspondance Littéraire de Grimm et Diderot*, Oct. 1770.

It must be remembered, however, that a French tragedy differs essentially from the dramatic representation which goes by that name in England. So much so, that in the essay from which we have been quoting, Diderot admits that a man who can act Shakspeare perfectly, is in all probability absolutely incapable of rendering Racine, 'ne sait pas le premier mot de la déclamation d'une scène de Racine.' It is probable that things so different as French and English acting may require different habits of mind, and different modes of study and execution; and that the long tirades of Phédre may be best declaimed by an actor who is really indifferent, and merely simulates passion, while the rapid natural dialogue of Shakspeare must be felt in order to be adequately expressed. And absolutely without denying the possibility of the mechanical acting of Pritchard and Miss Costigan, we must affirm also the compatibility of the deepest real emotion with the most vivid representation of it. Every one who had the happiness to be in the stage box when Jenny Lind pulled to pieces the rose in the *Sonnambula*, saw real tears running down her cheeks. And it is known that she declared that when on the stage she never saw the audience, and that if she ever thought of their presence it spoiled the truth of her acting. All the great performers that occur to our recollection have enjoyed the dangerous privileges, and have been subject to the painful joys, of the poetic temperament.

One of the most finished portraits is that of the gentlemanlike parasite Major Pendennis. Perhaps we ought rather to call him a tuft-hunter than a parasite. That word is generally used to signify a man who fawns on the rich for a subsistence. Now this Major Pendennis does not. His object is not a subsistence, the means which he uses are not fawning, nor is mere money the object of his adoration. He despises vulgar untitled opulence as much as he does vulgar untitled genius. His idol is not wealth, but fashion. To a certain extent his worship is disinterested; that is to say, it is paid to his patrons for their own sakes. He desires from them no favour except to be received into their society. He suns himself in the eyes of a man of fashion like a lover in those of his mistress. This state of feeling, familiar as it is to us, seems to have been unknown to the Greeks and to the Romans. The classical parasite was in search of something solid. He cringed for a dinner or a sportula, and cared little for the degradation by which he obtained them. Gross flattery was his readiest instrument, and as that was most palatable to the vulgarest minds, the vulgarest

of the rich were those to whom he was most desirous to pay court.

The objects of the modern tuft-hunter are less substantial. The values for which he barter his independence are, to use the language of political economy, immaterial. Familiarity with the great is, with him, not the means but the end. All that he asks from them is, their acquaintance. All the use that he makes of the acquaintance of one is to serve as a passport to that of another. In a society so vast and so changing as that of the English aristocracy, this pursuit, when adopted by a man who begins from the bottom, has the great advantage of being inexhaustible. He may grow old, as Major Pendennis does, in a constant process of climbing and balancing himself; sometimes rising a little higher, sometimes falling a little back; one day making good a lodgment in a new great house, another losing a valuable *entrée* by the death, or the ruin, or the caprice of the governor of the fortress—until at length he closes a long life, diligently and successfully employed, without a friend or even an intimate, without having done anything, or written anything, or said anything that can be remembered, but the undoubted possessor of a visiting list great in its quantity and irreproachable in its quality.

At the same time it must be allowed that a successful tuft-hunter cannot be a commonplace man,

‘*Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est.*’

As he succeeds by pleasing, he must possess the arts of pleasing. And as he has to exercise them upon persons whom familiarity with the most cultivated society has rendered fastidious, he must possess those arts in an eminent degree. He must have good manners and considerable education; he must talk well and listen well. He must enjoy a good temper, or be able to control a bad one. All these qualities Mr. Thackeray has given to the Major, and he has added to them courage, decision, presence of mind, and sagacity. And yet Major Pendennis does not obtain, and is not intended to obtain, our esteem. The frivolousness of the purposes for which they are employed, makes his talents and even his virtues contemptible. The reader cannot respect a man who does not respect himself, whose self-esteem depends altogether on the verdict of others, who is content to shine with borrowed light and to be splendid in borrowed plumes.

Mr. Thackeray has usually two heroines, a good one and a bad one; one to refuse the hero, the other to marry him. The bad heroine of Pendennis, Miss Blanche Amory, is a picture of

great merit, even taken alone, but still more when compared and contrasted with her predecessor, Becky Sharp. At first sight the features appear to be the same. Both are utterly heartless, both are utterly unscrupulous. The ruling passion of each is vanity, and each pursues her objects without the slightest regard to the rights, or the wishes, or the feelings of any one else. Each is clever and accomplished. They look, in short, at a distance, like twins. And yet, when we come to examine the details of the conduct of each of them, we find them not merely dissimilar but contrasted. Becky is a universal favourite; Blanche is uniformly detested. Becky is frank and simple; Blanche is a lump of affectation. Becky's subjects are faithful to her; Blanche's victims take the first opportunity of escaping from her. The seminal difference—the seed from which all the minor differences spring—is this: Mr. Thackeray has infused a strong dose of common sense into Becky, and a strong dose of folly into Blanche. Each is fond of power. Becky obtains her influence by the slow, sure process of being useful and agreeable. She seduces Miss Crawley, the rich woman of the world, by flattery and wit; old Sir Pitt Crawley, her brother, the bearish, loutish, country squire, by entering into all his schemes, correcting his blunders, and managing his whole household. When she quits him for a short visit to his sister, he follows to implore her immediate return. ‘I want you,’ he says; ‘I can’t git on without you. I didn’t see what it was till you went away. The house all goes wrong. It’s not the same place. All my accounts has got muddled agin. You must come back. Do come back! dear Becky, do come!’ The female favourite of the father is seldom that of the son; but she subjugates Sir Pitt the Second as effectually as Sir Pitt the First. She reveals to him the secret of his own talents and virtues; proves to him that he has undervalued himself, and is still more undervalued by his wife; and sends him home, after every visit, thinking to himself how much she admires him, and how much he deserves to be admired.

Such are the tactics of Becky. Blanche obtains her power by the coarse and easy instrument of fear. She domineers by teasing and frightening. Her *modus operandi* is well explained in an early dialogue between Sir Francis Clavering (her step-father) and Captain Strong, his resident companion and man of business.

“I say, Strong,” one day the Baronet said, as the pair were conversing after dinner over the billiard table, and that great unbosomer of secrets, a segar; “I say, Strong, I wish your wife was dead.”

“So do I.—That’s a cannon, by Jove.—But she won’t; she’ll live

for ever — you see if she don't. Why do you wish her off the hooks, Frank, my boy?" asked Captain Strong.

"Because then you might marry Missy. She ain't bad looking. She'll have ten thousand, and that's a good bit of money for such a poor devil as you," drawled out the other gentleman. "And gad, Strong, I hate her worse and worse every day. I can't stand her, Strong, by gad I can't."

"I wouldn't take her at twice the figure," Captain Strong said, laughing. "I never saw such a little devil in my life."

"I should like to poison her," said the sententious Baronet; "by Jove I should."

"Why, what has she been at now?" asked his friend.

"Nothing particular," answered Sir Francis; "only her old tricks. That girl has such a knack of making everybody miserable, that hang me it's quite surprising. Last night she sent the governess crying away from the dinner table. Afterwards, as I was passing Frank's room, I heard the poor little beggar howling in the dark, and found his sister had been frightening his soul out of his body, by telling him stories about the ghost that's in the house. At lunch she gave my lady a turn; and though my wife's a fool, she's a good soul—I'm hanged if she ain't."

"What did Missy do to her?" Strong asked.

"Why hang me, if she didn't begin talking about the late Amory, my predecessor," the Baronet said with a grin. "She got some picture out of the Keepsake, and said she was sure it was like her dear father. She wanted to know where her father's grave was. Hang her father! Whenever Miss Amory talks about him, Lady Clavering always bursts out crying: and the little devil will talk about him in order to spite her mother. To-day when she began, I got in a confounded rage, said I was her father, and — and that sort of thing; and then, Sir, she took a shy at me."

"And what did she say about you, Frank?" Mr. Strong, still laughing, inquired of his friend and patron.

"Gad, she said I wasn't her father; that I wasn't fit to comprehend her; that her father must have been a man of genius, and fine feelings, and that sort of thing: whereas I had married her mother for money."

"Well, didn't you?" asked Strong.

"It don't make it any the pleasanter to hear because it's true, don't you know?" Sir Francis Clavering answered. "I ain't a literary man and that; but I ain't such a fool as she makes me out. I don't know how it is, but she always manages to — to put me in the hole, don't you understand? She turns all the house round her in her quiet way. I wish she was dead, Ned." (Vol. i. pp. 225, 226.)

Becky's weapon is as sharp as Blanche's, perhaps sharper, and she is quite ready to use it when the necessity occurs: but she keeps it in reserve for that necessity; never draws it except in self-defence; and takes care that the wound, though it may smart, shall not rankle. She despises those about her too much

to feel lasting resentment; is always willing to shake hands with a baffled assailant; and generally manages that her adversary shall be as placable as she is herself. Neither Blanche nor Becky cares about truth; but Becky knows the value of falsehood, and that its power is easily worn out by promiscuous use. She reserves it therefore for great occasions, and tells the truth, unless something considerable is to be got by lying. Blanche lies without any motive except the exercise of her ingenuity, and thus wastes her mendacity to no purpose.

Neither Blanche nor Becky cares about her friends, but Blanche adopts and throws them away from mere caprice. She is constantly forming useless intimacies, and turning them into mischievous enmities. Becky bestows her affection only on those whom she thinks worthy of it; that is to say, on those whom she hopes to make her instruments. *If* she finds them useful, and *while* she finds them useful, she 'grapples them to her soul' with hooks of steel. When they become useless, she lets them go, but quietly and silently, without any breach, so that if at a future time they should become serviceable, as is the case in one or two memorable instances, she may be able at once to resuscitate them. Blanche and Becky are both fond of admiration, but Becky knows that it is not to be obtained by asking for it. She resolves to be simple and unaffected; and being a consummate actress, she succeeds. Blanche is always imploring attention, always trying on a new manner or a new character. 'She 'drags her shoulders,' says one of her intended victims, 'out of her dress; she never lets her eyes alone; she goes about simpering and ogling, like a French waiting-maid.' The inside of Becky is diseased enough, but the outside is polished, consistent, and natural. Blanche's exterior is in as bad taste as her interior is corrupt. It is all fantastic, gaudy, glaring, and ill-assorted.

Becky is a simple character; Blanche is an inconsistent one.

As we use these words in a technical sense, we shall explain them at some length; and we hope that our explanation may throw light on that portion of poetical imitation — by far the most important portion — which has human nature for its subject.

Fictitious characters may, we think, be conveniently divided into three classes — the Simple, the Mixed, and the Inconsistent.

By simple characters, we mean the persons to whom no qualities are attributed by the poet, except those which are subservient to one another, and co-operate in the main work which the person in question has to do. By mixed characters, we mean the persons who are endowed by him with different attributes, independent of one another, some of which are essential to the principal parts which they have to perform, and others have no

connexion with them. By inconsistent characters, we mean those who possess discordant qualities,—qualities which counteract or modify, or even neutralise, one another. The test whether a character is simple, mixed, or inconsistent is, to try what would be the effect of removing any one of its attributes. If that removal would leave it incomplete, unfit to execute the duties assigned to it by the poet, it is a simple character. If the quality supposed to be removed would not be missed, the character is mixed. If that removal would render the rest of the character more harmonious, more efficient for the performance of any one or more of its parts, it is not only mixed, but also inconsistent.

There are no simple characters in real life. Nature varies almost infinitely her attributes, and gives to every man innumerable qualities, some of which are independent of one another, and others are discordant. All her characters are both mixed and inconsistent; and it is this mixture and inconsistency that renders them distinct. Every human being belongs to so many thousand different classes, that no two individuals, possessing precisely the same qualities, in precisely the same proportions, have ever been found. But the poet has not space for these details. The greater part of his characters are simple, because they are wanted only for some particular purpose: they are the Fortis Gyas, fortisque Cloanthus, and Fidus Achates of his muster roll. All that we wish to know of Banquo, Shakspeare tells us; namely, that he is brave. All that we hear of Duncan is that he is kind. We should think it impertinent, if some scenes were added to Macbeth, for the purpose of showing what sort of a husband Banquo was, or what were the favourite amusements of Duncan. Even of the more highly finished characters, the greater part are simple. Ulysses is a simple character. The elements of which he is composed are, strong domestic and patriotic affections, patience, dissimulation, prudence, sagacity, presence of mind, fertility of resource, intrepidity, and daring amounting almost to rashness. Every one of these qualities was necessary to bring him from Ogygia to Ithaca, and to enable him to plan and to effect the destruction of the suitors. They form the whole of his character, so far as Homer has revealed it to us. Richard the Third is a simple character. Even his gaiety could not be abstracted from him without leaving a gap in the general outline. His wit is necessary to show his remorseless unscrupulousness, his unflinching audacity. It is provoked by his crimes. It is most brilliant when he is planning or executing, or reflecting on some atrocity. Hypocrisy, treachery, and murder are his sport. He prepares his crimes with satisfaction,—he looks back to them with mer-

riment. It is not that he has any pleasure in human suffering, but that he is utterly indifferent to it. He does not torture, he only kills, and kills only those who are in his way. But as obstacle after obstacle, that is to say, life after life, that rose between him and the crown, is removed, his delight breaks out in the bitter yet playful humour which makes him at once the most detestable and the most amusing of villains.

Perhaps the finest mixed character ever drawn is Henry, as Prince Hal and as Henry the Fifth. His levity and dissipation, pushed, as they are, almost to dissoluteness, have no connexion with his wisdom and courage. If the ludicrous scenes in the two parts of Henry the Fourth had never been written, we should not have felt their loss. The remainder would have formed a great tragedy, in which Prince Henry would have been a well-drawn, grand, and simple character. If the serious scenes had been lost, we should have had a most amusing comedy, with Falstaff and Hal as its heroes. And yet the character is not one of those to which we have given the name of inconsistent. The baser and the higher qualities of Henry do not interfere with one another. He throws off at once the trifier when he is required to rise into the hero, and the hero when he is at leisure to subside into the trifier. The reader perceives no incongruity. He feels that the same desire for excitement, indifference to consequences, and light-hearted audacity, seduce Hal to indulge his taste for humour at Gadshill and the Boar's Head, and impel Henry to seek glory by encountering Percy at Shrewsbury and all France at Agincourt.

Hotspur, like Henry, is tragi-comic. His wit and his humour almost rival those of Falstaff. They are most brilliant on the gravest occasions. He jests in a stormy interview with the king,—he jests when he is dividing England with his co-conspirators,—he is never more amusing than when he takes leave of his wife before his last fatal battle. And yet we are inclined to class him among simple characters. His gaiety is the mere ebullition of a bold, self-relying, impetuous, ambitious temper, which exults in contest and danger. His delight, as the struggle approaches, foams out in taunt, and jest, and mockery, but his levity does not influence his conduct. Levity is an element in the disposition of Prince Hal, but only in the *manner* of Hotspur.

We now come to inconsistent characters. It may be as well to state expressly, what perhaps is obvious, that by an inconsistent character we do not mean what is generally expressed by those words,—a character to which incompatible attributes are assigned. Such characters cannot exist in nature, and of course

ought to be banished from fiction. We repeat, that by an inconsistent character we mean one of which the elements, though compatible, are repugnant. The great painter of inconsistent characters is Pope. They suit his delight in contrast and antithesis. One of the most finished is that of Wharton.

' Thus with each gift of nature and of art,
And wanting nothing but an honest heart,
Grown all to all, from no one vice exempt;
And most contemptible, to shun contempt;
His Passion still, to covet gen'ral praise,
His Life, to forfeit it a thousand ways;
A constant Bounty, which no friend has made;
An angel Tongue, which no man can persuade;
A fool, with more of Wit than all mankind,
Too rash for thought, for action too refin'd:
A Tyrant to the wife his heart approves;
A Rebel to the very king he loves;
He dies, sad outcast of each church and state,
And, harder still! flagitious, yet not great.'

(*Moral Essays*, Ep. i. p. 193.)

Don Quixote is a boldly-drawn inconsistent character. He is a man of great good sense, and knowledge of books and of the world. If romances of chivalry had never been written he would have passed the whole of his life as he passed the greater part of it,—a respected country gentleman, dividing his time between literature, field sports, and society. But his head is turned by stories of knight-errantry. He devotes himself to their study, admits implicitly all their absurdities, and, while he remains sensible and sagacious on all other subjects, on this alone he is mad. He believes himself to be living in the times of Amadis de Gaul, and Florismarte of Hyrcania, expects adventures like theirs, and makes their conduct his model. So far as these delusions extend, his bodily and his mental senses are perverted. He takes windmills for giants, sheep for armies, pothouses for castles, and Maritornes for a princess. When out of his armour he is just and humane; but when occupied as a knight-errant, he thinks it his duty to require any passenger whom he meets to admit the peerless beauty of Dulcinea, and to murder those who refuse. As a philosopher, he reasons wisely on the theory of government, on the necessity of penal laws, and the duty of submission to authority: as a knight, he attacks the king's officers, breaks the chain of galley-slaves, and lets loose a band of wretches who have just confessed to him the justice of their sentences. With wonderful skill he is made to pass and repass from sanity to madness. He sits before Master Peter's puppet-show, a quiet, intelligent spectator, criticises the management of

the story, and objects to the introduction of bells as an anachronism; but no sooner is he interested in the scene than he believes in its reality, rushes at the little theatre to the rescue of Melisendra, cuts to pieces the hostile puppets, would have beheaded the showman himself if he had not ducked under his stage, and exclaims in the exultation of his triumph, 'Would to God that this could have been seen by all the despisers of knight-errantry! Where would the brave Gayferos and the beautiful Melisendra now have been if I had not been present?' The showman and Sancho convince him that he has taken puppets for men; he agrees to pay for the damage, and sits down with Master Peter and the innkeeper to compute it. King Marsilio, who has lost a head, is valued at four reals; Charlemagne, whose crown is split, at three; and for the fair Melisendra, whose nose is gone, Master Peter asks five. At the name of Melisendra, Don Quixote relapses into his delusion:—'Don't play your tricks upon me,' he cries; 'Melisendra must have been safe in Paris an hour ago. I watched her horse as she was making her escape: he was flying rather than galloping!'

For the perfection of the inconsistent character (as, indeed, for the perfection of every other) we must go to Shakspeare. One of the finest, among the many that he has drawn, is Othello. He is a union not merely of dissimilar qualities, but of dissimilar natures. He is a civilised barbarian. All that we know of his birth is, that it is 'fetched from men of royal siege.' How or when he became a Christian we are not told; but it is certain that he must have passed his childhood in a harem, acquiring with his earliest impressions the jealousy and suspicion respecting women, and the domestic despotism of a Mahometan court. His youth and manhood are military: and we find him, at the opening of the play, 'somewhat declined into the vale of years,' a grave and dignified soldier. He is

'The noble Moor, whom the full senate
Call all-in-all sufficient—the noble nature
Whom passion cannot shake; whose solid virtue
The shot of accident or dart of chance
Can neither graze nor pierce.'

All the barbarian is obliterated. His behaviour during the two first acts justifies Lodovico's praise. Nothing can be more calm or more polished. When, within one hour of his marriage, he is summoned before the senate, he does not resent the contumely or even the violence of Brabantio; he pleads his cause with consummate moderation and skill, accepts the command of Cyprus with modest self-reliance, obeys cheerfully the order of

instant departure, and, without a shadow of suspicion, places Desdemona in Iago's hands to follow him.

The very morning after their arrival at Cyprus, Iago darkly hints to him a doubt as to the firmness of Desdemona's virtue. He accuses her of nothing actually wrong, but states plausible grounds why she should be watched. The suspicion acts on Othello like a specific poison. It sets on fire all the old Mahometan tendency to jealousy, which a European life seemed to have eradicated. His barbarian nature reappears. At first his habits of civilisation combat it.

He proposes to act as becomes a great Venetian noble; to inquire into his wife's conduct; and, if Iago's suspicions prove unfounded, to forget them; if they are confirmed, to separate himself from Desdemona, —

He says,

'I'll see, before I doubt; when I doubt, prove.

If I *do* prove her haggard,

I'll whistle her off, and let her down the wind:

Away at once with love or jealousy.'

Desdemona enters, and he exclaims, —

'If she be false, O, then heaven mocks itself! —

I'll not believe it.'

They go together to a great dinner, at the end of which Othello and Iago meet again.

By this time the barbarian has got the upper hand. He demands, indeed, from Iago proof of Desdemona's guilt, but in the meantime assumes it. Iago tells him, by way of proof, that lately he lay with Cassio, and heard him exclaim in his sleep, —

'Sweet Desdemona,

Let us hide our loves.

Oh, cursed fate, that gave thee to the Moor!'

The falsehood of this story was obvious. Cassio and Iago had parted the very evening of the marriage; they had arrived at Cyprus in separate ships the day before this conversation took place, and the intervening night had been the busy one which was filled by the drunken quarrel and Cassio's disgrace.

Othello swallows it with savage credulity. He no longer thinks of inquiry, or of separation. He is again the Arab or the Bedouin of his youth, and no conduct, except such as might fit a Bedouin or an Arab, occurs to him.

He cries,

'Oh blood, Iago, blood!

Within these three days let me hear thee say,

That Cassio's not alive. — I will withdraw,
To furnish me with some swift means of death
For the fair devil. Now art thou my lieutenant.'

The last words are remarkable. Othello has so thoroughly forgotten the habits of civilised life, that he does not see that, after having murdered his wife, the daughter of a Venetian senator, and assassinated Cassio, a man of high rank in the republic, he cannot remain governor of Cyprus. Well may Desdemona exclaim, —

'My lord is not my lord ; nor should I know him,
Were he in favour, as in humour, altered.'

From thence until the very last scene the savage in him reigns triumphant. He does not preserve even the outward proprieties of his station, but insults and strikes his wife in the presence of the envoy from the senate.

But the instant that he has satiated his revenge, the spirit from the desert seems to be appeased by the sacrifice, and quits him. He now 'knows that his act shows horrible and 'grim.' He listens to the proofs of Desdemona's innocence, apologises frankly to Cassio, and sits in judgment on his own folly and crime. The horror of his situation, instead of disturbing, quiets him. He resumes the calm dignity of a great Venetian leader. Lodovico proposes to carry him away a close prisoner for trial. Othello makes no direct answer to the threat, but draws in a few clear and singularly unimpassioned lines, a short outline 'of these unlucky deeds,' and then retires from the 'extreme perplexity' in which he is involved by the only exit that is left to him, a resolute and not undignified suicide.

Mr. Thackeray's Blanche is, as we said before, an inconsistent character. Her desire of power is constantly interfering with her desire of sympathy. She cannot help teasing those whom she wishes to please. In her pursuit of immediate admiration she loses permanent esteem, and becomes a plaything when she aims at being an idol. When she sits between two admirers, she flirts alternately with each, and thus betrays to them both the emptiness of her kindness. Becky, we repeat, is a simple character. Numerous as her qualities are, they are not discordant. Not one of them could be taken from her without damaging her powers of worldly advancement.

Rawdon Crawley is one of Mr. Thackeray's best inconsistent characters. He is a gambler, indeed a blackleg, and would be an actual swindler if a swindler could be tolerated in society. He approaches as near to swindling as the law will allow. He preys on the young and the inexperienced, contracts debts

which he knows never can be paid, and lies whenever it suits his convenience. Yet this degraded nature has its amiable and its respectable side. He is fond of his wife and of his child. He is brave, and he is grateful. He has an honour of his own, which, though its province is narrow, reigns there supreme. He knows that his only chance of escaping ruin is through the friendship of Lord Steyne. But the instant that he suspects how that friendship has been purchased, he breaks with his patron, sends back, poor as he is, the thousand pounds which he believes to have been Steyne's present to Becky, and is with difficulty restrained from shooting him.

Arthur Pendennis is a mixed character. He is a poet grafted on a dandy. So far as he is a dandy, he is vain, conceited, and extravagant. So far as he is a poet, he is inflammable and inconstant, easily attracted and easily repelled. Having scarcely any seriously adopted opinions, or principles, or plans, he is at the mercy of those around him. It is a defect in the story that his conduct recurs in a sort of circle. He falls in love with an actress, and is jilted; makes love to Blanche, is well received by her, and then cast off, and to please his mother offers himself to Laura; she refuses him, and so ends the first volume.

In the second volume he falls in love with a porter's daughter, and is cured by a fever; to please his uncle he proposes himself again to Blanche, and is engaged to her. She jilts him again, and again he offers himself to Laura; and, as it was necessary to end the novel, this time she accepts him.

There is nothing very attractive in such an outline, but many of the details are full of beauty. The wonder with which, after he is cured of an attachment, he revisits its former object, is admirably described. So is his last courtship of Blanche at Tunbridge Wells, where the *blasé* dandy and *blasée* flirt, after mutual attempts, all ineffectual, to be fond and sentimental, confess to one another that the marriage is not of their own seeking, but has been arranged for them by their mammas and uncles, and that they must submit to it like a good little boy and girl.

We have said nothing about the tragical parts of the story—about Colonel Altamont and his frightful secret and mysterious threats; or Warrington's discarded wife. They are tacked so slightly to the comic portions, that they might easily be detached altogether. And if Mr. Thackeray should think fit hereafter to lighten Pendennis, and so improve its chances of floating down to posterity, we recommend that these be the portions of its rigging that are first cut away.

Esmond is a reproduction of the manners, feelings, thoughts, and even style which prevailed from 180 to 140 years ago. It is a wonderful *tour de force*. Without doubt, one of the charms of art is the triumph over difficulty. But the triumph must not be a barren one. The value of what is gained must bear a considerable proportion to the labour that has been expended. The epic in twenty-four books, from each of which a letter was eliminated, was not more but less pleasing than if the author had allowed himself free use of the alphabet. Taken at the best, the task of a novelist is difficult. It is no easy thing to invent a plausible story, a story which shall have a beginning, a middle, and an end,—a beginning which shall raise expectation, a middle which shall continue it, and an end which shall satisfy it. Neither Richardson nor Fielding has succeeded in doing so more than once. It is less difficult, but still far from easy, to people that story with characters, distinct, natural, and amusing; and to make them talk and act like the living models supplied by the author's experience. If to the obstacles which nature has thrown across his path, the poet thinks fit to add fresh ones of his own; if he builds up walls in order to jump over them, the reader always suspects that what is supplied to him is not the author's best; that some real merit which he would have enjoyed is sacrificed to an imaginary one which he does not care about.

Now the amount of the self-imposed burden which Mr. Thackeray has undertaken to bear may be estimated, when we consider how few have been the writers who have ventured to submit to it. For at least 3000 years poets have taken their principal characters from history or mythology. But they have seldom borrowed more than the names, and perhaps one or two of the most notorious qualities, and one or two of the most notorious adventures, of their heroes. Everything else they have generally copied from what they saw around them. All Homer's men and women, whether they be Europeans or Asiatics, Greeks or Phœacians, Trojans or allies, speak the same language, use the same weapons, amuse themselves with the same games, worship the same gods, believe in the same legends, are in fact identical in habits and manners. All those of Virgil, whether natives of Ilium, or Carthage, or Sicily, or Latium, are Romans of the Augustan age. Four great tragic poets, perhaps the four greatest that ever wrote, have brought on the stage Theseus. In the *Œdipus Coloneus*, he is an Athenian statesman; in the *Supplices*, an Athenian rhetorician; in *Phœdre*, a courtier of Louis Quatorze; and in the *Midsummer*

Night's Dream, a highly educated English gentleman. Not one of these great writers thought himself bound to reproduce the Theseus of tradition, half-savage, half-divine, the first cousin and imitator of Hercules, who roamed over Greece destroying robbers, killing wild beasts, and carrying off women; a mixture of giant and knight-errant; raised, according to one legend, for his virtues, to be a god; according to another, for his crimes seated for ever in hell. Even Walter Scott, though, in order to please critics who are intolerant of anachronisms, he endeavours to copy the manners and feelings of a past age, does not try to speak in its language or in its style. His events may be mediæval, but he relates them like any other novelist of the nineteenth century. Though the scene of *Rob Roy* is laid 140 years ago, and though Osbaldiston is his own biographer, he tells his story as if he had just finished his education in the new town of Edinburgh. The courage, the diligence, and the skill of Mr. Thackeray have enabled him to avoid this inconsistency. Colonel Esmond writes as one of the best of her wits might have written in the reign of Queen Anne.

We cannot, however, avoid thinking that this merit has been purchased too dearly. The reader feels always that he is listening to falsetto tones; that he is looking at the imitation of an imitation. If Esmond had been confined within as short limits, it might have taken rank with the 'Defence of Natural Society.' But a parody three volumes long becomes tiresome. We want the author to throw aside the fetters which impede his movements, though we require him to keep the costume which disguises his person. We wish to hear Jacob's own voice, though the hands be the hands of Esau.

The period at which Mr. Thackeray has laid his scene was scarcely a matter of choice, when once he had determined to imitate antiquated forms of thought and expression. Those who succeeded the wits of Queen Anne's days were moderns. Thomson, Goldsmith, Adam Smith, and Hume, all remembered Pope and Swift; but they wrote as we do; — better, perhaps, so far as they took more pains, but with no other perceptible difference. The giants, indeed, who ruled the literary world between the Reformation and the Restoration used a style and a language sufficiently different from our own; but they were unfit for domestic narrative. No one could have tolerated the loves of Beatrix and Esmond enveloped in the grand periods of Bacon or Milton, or even in the quaint, loose verbiage of the *Arcadia*. The school which Mr. Thackeray has imitated was remote enough to be peculiar, and near enough for its peculiarities not to offend.

But that period had little else to recommend it. It was one to which every Englishman must look back with disgust. Up to the Restoration the English, at least in the higher classes, had been a serious people. Primogeniture as respects land, and the exclusion of the younger branches of even the greatest houses from nobility, — the happy accident from which so many of our peculiarities flow, — had prevented the existence among us of the idle, frivolous caste which, during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, formed the aristocracy of the greater part of the Continent; a caste excluded by its prejudices from commerce, from the bar, from medicine, and, except in its high dignities, from the church, and naturally led, with the exception of the small portion of it that could find employment in arms, to dedicate its ample leisure to place-hunting and amusement. From the Conquest until the Restoration the rich and the noble of England had had duties to perform. The rich were great merchants or feudal proprietors; the noble were statesmen or soldiers; all the members of the younger branches, and the younger members of the eldest branch, who in France would have thronged the court of the sovereign, or lived in the *ruelles* of the capital, were actively engaged in business or in professions.

But during the sixty or seventy years which immediately followed the Restoration, London seems to have been the headquarters of a fashionable crowd which, in numbers, in wealth, in idleness, in dissoluteness, in every thing, in short, except education and refinement, rivalled the *grand monde* of Paris. Of course we cannot now dwell on the causes of this phenomenon. The increased wealth of the unemployed class was probably connected with the abolition of the feudal tenures, and the facilities thereby given to mortgages and sales, the increased occupation of land by tenants instead of by proprietors, the enormous augmentation of trade, and the large incomes, indeed, the large fortunes, that could be made in the public service, or squeezed from the royal bounty. Its dissoluteness was partly a reaction against the austerities of Puritanism, and partly a coarse imitation of the polished dissipation of France; but it would probably have shown itself, even if there had been no Puritans, and no French: in fact, it was the necessary result of wealth wanting occupation and literature. There were, of course, literary circles as brilliant as those of any other period, the circles in which the great writers of that age were formed; but every thing shows that the mass of the fashionable world was then deplorably ignorant. The women knew nothing, and professed to know nothing. The men passed many of their mornings, and almost all their evenings, in clubs, and at the

theatres; smoking, drinking, and playing at cards, or listening to stilted tragedies or indecent comedies.

This levity was made hideous by the intermixture of ferocity not more savage, indeed, perhaps less so, than that of the previous century, but horrible in itself, and still more horrible as the cruelty of careless voluptuaries. A sanguinary penal code was enforced with unrelenting severity. Temple Bar and London Bridge were fringed with human heads. With not one-fourth of the present population, there were probably fifty times as many executions every year as there are now. The whippings of females, as well as of males, were perpetual, and were paraded up and down the most public thoroughfares; and yet these punishments were as inefficacious as they were cruel. The roads around London were beset by highwaymen; the streets were infested by footpads; amateurs in crime, who have been immortalised in 'The Spectator' under the name of Mohocks, insulted and injured passengers by way of amusement. No one seems to have engaged in politics who was not sooner or later, and generally more than once, guilty of treason; the basest and the most unscrupulous traitors being those whom their crowns placed above the law. Duels were frequent and ferocious; the seconds fought as well as the principals, and victory was often obtained by treachery. Other aristocracies may have been more contemptible, but none can have been less attractive or amiable, than that of the English court from the return of Charles the Second down to the death of Queen Anne.

Over-indulgence, except indeed to the whimpering little goddess whom he deifies in every novel, is not Mr. Thackeray's weakness. His *dramatis personæ* are as black as their originals could have been. The only prominent male character who is not an habitual drunkard is the hero. Three Lord Castlewoods are introduced. The first is described as passing his early life abroad, where he was remarkable only for duelling, vice, and play,—and where he marries and then deserts the mother of the hero. He passes his middle age in London, a hanger-on of ordinaries, and a brawler about Alsatia and Whitefriars; marries during his first wife's life an old maid with money; and is killed at the battle of the Boyne. The second is a drunken sensualist, who ill-treats and insults his wife, spoils his children, gambles away his property, and is killed in a duel. The third turns Roman Catholic, marries ill, quarrels with his own relations, and is left, at the end of the story, the slave of his wife's family of German adventurers.

The hero, of course, possesses the ordinary heroic qualities of courage, generosity, and affectionateness. But even *he* con-

spires for the purpose of occasioning a new revolution, though he strongly suspects that his success will be mischievous to his country. He is not seduced by the entreaties of any friend; he is not driven on by the blind, instinctive, spaniel-like loyalty, which leads a legitimist to throw his fortunes, his life, his family, and even his patriotism at the feet of him whom he adores as his sovereign. He is himself the originator of the scheme; he estimates calmly the results; 'has his own forebodings as to what they may be, his usual sceptic doubts as to the benefit which may accrue to the country by bringing a 'tipsy young monarch back to it.' The motive which, in spite of all these doubts and forebodings, impels him to endeavour to inflict, at the hazard of a civil war, such a master on his country, is merely the hope that by doing so he may please his cousin Beatrix Esmond, one of the heroines of the novel, a violent Tory, who for ten long years has been the object of Esmond's unsuccessful adoration. With no other object, he brings the Pretender in disguise to England, and conceals him in the house of his relation Lady Castlewood, the mother of Beatrix. His suspicions as to the worthlessness of his intended master increase during the journey, and are turned into convictions by the Prince's behaviour as a guest. Still he perseveres, until the Prince's attentions to Beatrix become marked. Then,

'Horrible doubts and torments racked Esmond's soul. 'Twas a scheme of personal ambition, a daring stroke for a selfish end—he knew it. What cared he in his heart who was king? Were not his very sympathies and secret convictions on the other side—on the side of People, Parliament, Freedom?—And here was he engaged for a prince that had scarce heard the word liberty; that priests and women, tyrants by nature both, made a tool of.' (Vol. iii. p. 234.)

Beatrix is sent into the country; and Esmond, having provided against this danger, resumes the conspirator, and passes a long day with the Prince, 'writing proclamations and addresses to the country, to the Scots, to the clergy, to the 'people of London and England, announcing the arrival of the 'exiled descendant of three sovereigns, and his acknowledgment 'by his sister as heir to the throne.' The Prince discovers the banishment of Beatrix, and resents it. 'If I have garters to 'give away,' he cries, 'tis to noblemen who are not so ready 'to think evil. Bring me a coach, and let me quit this place, 'or let the fair Beatrix return to it.'

Esmond's loyalty is instantly suspended. He takes the Prince to a window looking into Kensington Square, where the watchman is crying the hour; reminds his guest, the man whom he is endeavouring to make his sovereign, that 5000L.

is offered by Parliament for his capture, points out to him how easily he could betray him; and adds, 'By the Heaven that made me I would do so, if I thought the Prince, for *his* honour's sake, would not desist from insulting *ours*.'

The Prince promises amendment, and Esmond continues as zealously as before to urge on the revolution. The Prince renews his attempts on Beatrix. Esmond breaks his sword, and renounces him. Detestable as most of the characters in the novel are, we do not recollect one to whom equal selfishness and wickedness are attributed. Even in France, demoralised as it has been by sixty years of revolutions, the most unprincipled *émeutier* would not make one merely to gratify his mistress.

We have already mentioned Mr. Thackeray's practice of having a good and a bad heroine; the one to refuse the hero, the other to marry him. In Esmond they are mother and daughter, the daughter being the bad heroine who rejects, the mother the good heroine who accepts. We do not object to the mere disparity of age. Many a boy of eighteen has fallen in love with a woman of twenty-eight. But in this case a man of forty falls in love with a woman of about fifty,—a woman with whom he has lived in intimacy ever since he was a child, who was the confidant and approver for many years of his love for her own daughter, whom he has always considered, and wished to consider, as his mother. Such a plot is neither natural nor pleasing.

Both the heroines are well drawn. The whole work is full of praises of the mother, Lady Castlewood. Perhaps these are meant only to show the uxoriousness of Esmond; but if they express Mr. Thackeray's opinion as to the beauty of the portrait which he has painted, we feel bound to record our dissent. Lady Castlewood appears to us to be a woman with a strong sense of duty and religion, and a heart always overflowing with affection, and eager to receive it. But all is spoilt by violence of temper, and by a jealousy so irritable and so exclusive, that even Esmond, after their marriage, cannot venture in her presence to show his love for their daughter. 'Her husband's love,' says the daughter, Mrs. Warrington, 'was a gift so precious, that she was for keeping it all, and could part with none of it, even to her daughter.' Mr. Warrington affirms that their happiness in marriage was perfect. If that was true, Colonel Esmond's standard of happiness must have been low, since it was conferred on him by a wife of strong feelings, irritable, suspicious temper, quick sensibility, and indiscriminating, unrelenting jealousy.

One or two scenes from the first volume will illustrate her

character. Her beauty has been somewhat impaired by small-pox, and her husband has neglected her for a Mrs. Marwood.

"'Twas after Jason left her, no doubt," Lady Castlewood said, with one of her smiles to young Esmond (who was reading to her a version of certain lines out of Euripides), "that Medea became a learned woman, and a great enchantress."

"And she could conjure the stars out of heaven," the young tutor added, "but she could not bring Jason back again."

"What do you mean?" asked my lady, very angry.

"Indeed I mean nothing," said the other, "save what I have read in books. What should I know about such matters? I have seen no woman save you and little Beatrix, and the parson's wife, and my late mistress, and your ladyship's woman here."

"The men who wrote your books," says my lady, "your Horaces, and Ovids, and Virgils, as far as I know of them, all thought ill of us, as all the heroes they wrote about used us basely. We were bred to be slaves always; and even of our own times, as you are still the only lawgivers, I think our sermons seem to say that the best woman is she who bears her master's chains most gracefully. 'Tis a pity there are no nunneries permitted by our church. Beatrix and I would fly to one, and end our days in peace there away from you."

"And is there no slavery in a convent?" says Esmond.

"At least if women are slaves there no one sees them," answered the lady. "They don't work in street gangs with the public to jeer at them; and if they suffer, they suffer in private. Here comes my lord home from hunting. Take away the books, my lord does not love to see them. Lessons are over for to-day, Mr. Tutor." And with a curtsy and a smile she would end this sort of colloquy. (Vol. i. pp. 204, 205, 206.)

Lord Castlewood next confides to Esmond *his* annoyances.

"Is a woman," he says, "never to forgive a husband who goes a tripping? Do you take me for a saint?"

"Indeed, Sir, I do not," says Harry, with a smile.

"Since that time my wife is as cold as the statue at Charing Cross. I tell thee she has no forgiveness in her, Henry. Her coldness blights my whole life, and sends me to the punch-bowl or driving about the country. My children are not mine, but hers, when we are together. 'Tis only when she is out of sight with her abominable cold glances, that they'll come to me, and that I dare to give them as much as a kiss; and that's why I take 'em and love 'em in other people's houses, Harry. I'm killed by the very virtue of that proud woman. Virtue! Give me the virtue that can forgive; give me the virtue that thinks not of preserving itself, but of making other folks happy." (Vol. i. pp. 270, 271.)

Esmond fancies that this is a case for mediation, and ventured most gently to hint to his adored mistress, that she was doing her husband harm by her ill opinion of him; and that the happiness of all the family depended upon setting her right.

"Have you ever heard me utter a word in my lord's disparagement?" she asked hastily, hissing out her words, and stamping her foot.

"Indeed, no," Esmond said, looking down.

"Are you come to me as his ambassador—*You*?" she continued.

"I would sooner see peace between you than anything else in the world," Harry answered; "and would go on any embassy that had that end."

"So *you* are my lord's go-between?" she went on, not regarding this speech. "You are sent to bid me back into slavery again, and inform me that my lord's favour is graciously restored to his hand-maid? He is weary of Covent Garden, is he, that he comes home and would have the fattest calf killed?"

"There's good authority for it, surely," said Esmond.

"For a son, yes: but my lord is not my son. It was he who broke our happiness down, and he bids me to repair it. I presume you have fulfilled your mission now, Sir. Perhaps you too have learned to love drink, and to hiccup over your wine or punch;—which is your worship's favourite liquor? Perhaps you too put up at the Rose on your way through London, and have your acquaintances in Covent Garden. My services to you, Sir, to principal and ambassador, to master and—lacquey." (Vol. i. pp. 273—275.)

Beatrix is inconsistent in the sense in which we use that word. She has great excellences and great defects, and her different qualities interfere with one another. She has courage, decision, presence of mind, and, for some purposes, self-command. She has intelligence, eloquence, wit, and knowledge of men and of things. This powerful machinery is directed by ambition and vanity, and driven by a strong will. But her pride is overbearing, her affections are capricious, her temper is irritable and wayward, and she inherits her mother's jealousy. She has a quick moral sense, a clear perception of the distinctions between virtue and vice, and a general wish to do right, and yet she is perpetually doing wrong—not from ignorance or carelessness, or callous familiarity with evil—she is conscious of her faults while she is committing them, conscious of her defects while she is yielding to them, she repents when all is over,—but she obeys the passion of the moment. Here are two views of her by herself. The first is drawn just after she is engaged to the Duke of Hamilton:—

"I hope the world will make you happy, Beatrix," says Esmond, with a sigh. "You'll be Beatrix till you are my Lady Duchess—will you not? I shall then make your Grace my very lowest bow."

"None of these sighs and this satire, cousin," she says; "I take his Grace's great bounty thankfully—yes, thankfully; and will wear his honours becomingly. I do not say that he hath touched my heart; but he has my gratitude, obedience, admiration. I have told him that,

and no more ; and with that his noble heart is content. I am twenty-five years old." "Twenty-six, my dear," says Esmond. "Twenty-five, sir. I choose to be twenty-five ; and in eight years, no man hath ever touched my heart. Yes, you did once for a little, Harry, when you came back, after Lille, and engaging with that murderer, Mohun, and saving Frank's life—I thought I could like you ; and mamma begged me hard, on her knees, and I did—for a day. But the old chill came over me, Harry, and the old fear of you and your melancholy ; and I was glad when you went away, and engaged with my Lord Ashburnham, that I might hear no more of you, that's the truth. You are too good for me somehow. I could not make you happy, and should break my heart in trying and not being able to love you. But if you had asked me when we gave you the sword, you might have had me, Sir, and we both should have been miserable by this time." (Vol. iii. pp. 112, 113.)

The second occurs soon after that engagement has terminated by the Duke's violent death. She is taking leave of Esmond as he sets out on his perilous expedition to bring the Pretender to London :—

"Stay, Harry," continued she, with a tone that had more despondency in it than she was accustomed to show. "Hear a last word ; I do love you. I do admire you—who would not, that has known such love as yours has been for us all ? But I think I have no heart. At least I have never seen the man that could touch it ; and had I found him, I would have followed him in rags, had he been a private soldier, or to sea, like one of those buccaneers you used to read to us about when we were children. I would do anything for such a man, bear anything for him ; but I never found one. You were ever too much of a slave to win my heart ; even my Lord Duke could not command it. I had not been happy had I married him. I knew that three months after our engagement—and was too vain to break it. O Harry ! I cried once or twice, not for him, but with tears of rage because I could not be sorry for him. I was frightened to find I was glad of his death ; and were I joined to you, I should have the same sense of servitude, the same longing to escape. We should both be unhappy, and you the most, who are as jealous as the Duke was himself. I tried to love him ; I tried, indeed I did : affected gladness when he came ; submitted to hear when he was by me ; and tried the wife's part I thought I was to play for the rest of my days.

'But half an hour of that complaisance wearied me, and what would a lifetime be ? My thoughts were away when he was speaking ; and I was thinking, O that this man would drop my hand, and rise up from before my feet. I knew his great and noble qualities, greater and nobler than mine a thousand times, as yours are, cousin,—I tell you a million and a million times better. But 'twas not for these I took him,—I took him to have a great place in the world, and I lost it,—I lost it, and do not deplore him,—and I often thought as I listened to his fond vows and ardent words, O, if I yield to this man

and meet *the other*, I shall hate him and leave him. I am not good, Harry : my mother is gentle and good, like an angel ; I wonder how she should have had such a child. She is weak, but she would die rather than do a wrong ; I am stronger than she, but I would do it out of defiance. I do not care for what the parsons tell me with their droning sermons ; I used to see them at court, as mean and as worthless as the meanest woman there. O I am sick and weary of the world. I wait but for one thing, and when 'tis done I will take Frank's religion and your poor mother's, and go into a nunnery and end like her."

Here is a grand scene, in which Lady Castlewood, her son, and Esmond force her into the country to escape the solicitations of the Prince. Lady Castlewood proposes to accompany her :—

"For shame !" burst out Beatrix, in a passion of tears and mortification. "You disgrace me by your cruel precautions ; my own mother is the first to suspect me, and would take me away as my gaoler. I will not go with you, mother ; I will go as no one's prisoner. If I wanted to deceive, do you think I could find no means of evading you ? My family suspects me. As those mistrust me that ought to love me most, let me leave them ; I will go, but I will go alone : to Castlewood, be it. I have been unhappy there and lonely enough ; let me go back ; but spare me at least the humiliation of setting a watch over my misery, which is a trial I can't bear. Let me go when you will, but alone, or not at all. You three can stay and triumph over my unhappiness, and I will bear it as I have borne it before. Let my gaoler-in-chief go order the coach that is to take me away. I thank you, Henry Esmond, for your share in the conspiracy. All my life long, I'll thank you, and remember you ; and you, brother, and you, mother, how shall I show my gratitude to you for your careful defence of my honour ?"

"She swept out of the room with the air of an empress, flinging glances of defiance at us all, and leaving us conquerors of the field, but scared, and almost ashamed of our victory. It did indeed seem hard and cruel that we three should have conspired the banishment and humiliation of that fair creature. We looked at each other in silence ; 'twas not the first stroke by many of our actions in that unlucky time, which being done, we wished undone. We agreed it was best she should go alone, speaking stealthily to one another, and under our breaths, like persons engaged in an act they felt ashamed in doing." (Vol. iii. pp. 260, 261.)

We are always ordered to admire the beauty of a heroine ; but if we obey, it is usually an act of faith. The description is so vague, that we are forced to take her charms on trust. But Mr. Thackeray's portrait of Beatrix is so animated and so individualised, that it affects the imagination as if it were painted in colours instead of words :—

* "She was a brown beauty ; that is, her eyes, hair, and eyebrows and eyelashes, were dark : her hair curling with rich undulations,

and waving over her shoulders; but her complexion was as dazzling white as snow in sunshine; except her cheeks, which were a bright red, and her lips, which were of a still deeper crimson. Her mouth and chin, they said, were too large and full, and so they might be for a goddess in marble, but not for a woman whose eyes were fire, whose look was love, whose voice was the sweetest love song, whose shape was perfect symmetry, health, decision, activity; whose foot as it planted itself on the ground was firm but flexible, and whose motion, whether rapid or slow, was always perfect grace,—agile as a nymph, lofty as a queen,—now melting, now imperious, now sarcastic, there was no single movement of hers but was beautiful. As he thinks of her, he who writes feels young again, and remembers a paragon.' (Vol. ii. pp. 115, 116.)

Beatrice is the only character in *Esmond* that interests; but there are many that amuse. All of them, indeed, amuse; for, except when he is playing with a doll which he wants to dress up as a good heroine, Mr. Thackeray can produce nothing that is not amusing.

One of the best is Father Holt. Mr. Thackeray has wisely abandoned the demure face and stealthy walk and soft hypocrisy of the conventional Jesuit. His Jesuit is a bold, gay man of the world, frank in his exterior, intrepid in danger, kind and affectionate to those whom it is not his interest to injure, unscrupulous when an instrument is to be obtained or an obstacle is to be removed, and keeping in a separate compartment of his mind, undisturbed by the politics with which the rest is filled, his classical tastes and his theological speculations. Such, we have no doubt, the men of action in the order, the men whose intrigues aimed at establishing or subverting thrones, always must have been and always will be.

James the Third has sat to two great painters. Walter Scott took him in middle age, and painted him with a grave and melancholy expression; serious, dignified, and imposing. Mr. Thackeray gives him to us in his youth, before he had been saddened by disappointment and improved by experience. His levity, his sensualism, his obstinacy, his ingratitude, his habitual sacrifice of the future to the present, of business to pleasure, and of every person and of every purpose to his own immediate gratification, are features boldly conceived and vigorously executed: and Mr. Thackeray has skilfully thrown over the whole a varnish of courtesy and graciousness, which softens and renders almost pleasing the despicable and odious character that lies beneath it. Sir Walter was as much of a Jacobite as it was possible to be in the nineteenth century. Mr. Thackeray's politics are not obtruded. What peeps out of them appears to us to be Whig. James the Third has fared in their hands accordingly.

We cannot quit Esmond without remarking the excellence of the still-life vignettes with which it is adorned. Castlewood House is described over and over, and always with fresh beauty. With great skill it is generally made to form the background of some memorable incident, and imprinted with that incident on the conception of the relator. It is thus introduced, with wonderful effect, just after the parting of Mohun and Castlewood, in apparent amity, but with a fatal quarrel in the heart of each.

‘Lord Castlewood stood at the door watching his guest and his people as they went out under the arch of the outer gate. When he was there, Lord Mohun turned once more; my Lord Viscount slowly raised his beaver, and bowed. His face wore a peculiar livid look, Harry thought. He cursed and kicked away his dogs, which came jumping about him — then he walked up to the fountain in the centre of the court, and leaned against a pillar and looked into the basin. As Esmond crossed over to his own room, late the chaplain’s, on the other side of the court, and turned to enter in at the low door, he saw Lady Castlewood looking through the curtains of the great window of the drawing room over head at my lord as he stood regarding the fountain. There was in the court a peculiar silence : and the scene remained long in Esmond’s memory : — the sky bright over head : the buttresses of the building and the sun-dial casting shadow over the gilt *memento mori* inscribed underneath : the two dogs, a black greyhound and a spaniel nearly white, the one with his face up to the sun, and the other snuffing amongst the grass and stones, and my lord leaning over the fountain, which was splashing audibly. ‘Tis strange how that scene and the sound of that fountain remain fixed on the memory of a man who has beheld a hundred sights of splendour, and danger too, of which he has kept no account.’ (Vol. i. pp. 313, 314, 315.)

We will extract another, of equal vividness. Esmond is revisiting Castlewood.

‘He had not seen its ancient grey towers and well-remembered woods for nearly fourteen years, and since he rode thence with my lord, to whom his mistress with her young children by her side waved an adieu. There was the fountain in the court babbling its familiar music, the old hall and its furniture, the carved chair my late lord used, the very flagon he drank from. Esmond’s mistress knew he would like to sleep in the little room he used to occupy ; ’twas made ready for him, and wall-flowers and sweet herbs set in the adjoining chamber, the chaplain’s room.

‘Esmond rose up before the dawn, passed into the next room, where the air was heavy with the odour of the wall-flowers, and tried the spring, and whether the window worked still. The spring had not been touched for years, but yielded at length, and the whole fabric of the window sank down. Esmond closed the casement up again, as the dawn was rising over Castlewood village ; he could

hear the clinking at the blacksmith's forge yonder among the trees, across the green, and past the river, on which a mist still lay sleeping.' (Vol. iii. pp. 171—174.)

When an author has been long and repeatedly before the public, the verdict of that great tribunal is likely to be a fair one. We believe its judgment on Mr. Thackeray—a judgment which we are not inclined to question—to be this :

That he is a bad constructor of a story ; that his openings are tedious and involved, his conclusions abrupt and unsatisfactory ; and that the intervening space is filled by incidents with little mutual dependence, and sometimes, as in *Pendennis*, repetitions of one another. On the other hand, it is admitted that these incidents, taken separately, are often admirable, well imagined, and well told, and amusing exhibitions of the weaknesses or the vices of those who take part in them.

We say ' weaknesses or vices,' because this is the second reproach addressed to Mr. Thackeray. It is said that his men, if they are not absurd, are tyrants or rogues : that his women, if they are not fools, are intriguers or flirts. This accusation, if it be an accusation, is true as respects his men ; and nearly true as respects his women.

If the *dramatis personæ* of *Vanity Fair* were average samples of the two millions who form the nation that inhabits London, or even if they were samples of what an American would call the Upper Ten Thousand of the Londoners, the London world would be a detestable one. It would be as black morally as it is physically.

Now we are ready to admit that the darkness of Mr. Thackeray's patterns is an artistic defect : that is to say, we think that their texture and general effect would be improved by the introduction of a few threads, not as milkwhite and as superfine as Sir Charles Grandison or *Clarissa*, but of good average quality and colour ; such as Belford, or Colonel Morden, or Miss Howe, or Lady G. But if the objection be not to the artistic effect but to the truth of Mr. Thackeray's characters, if he be accused of giving not merely an unpleasant but a false view of human nature, the answer is this : that in *Esmond* the scene is laid in what we have already described as the period in which the English character was most demoralised ; and that in *Vanity Fair* the characters are taken almost exclusively from two classes—the pursuers of nothing but wealth, and the pursuers of nothing but pleasure. Mr. Thackeray paints the former as vain, greedy, purseproud, oppressive, and overbearing in prosperity, and grovelling and base in adversity, and envious and suspicious at all times. He describes the latter as frivolous,

heartless, and false, with as much selfishness and vanity and malignity as their Russell-Square neighbours, though concealed under a smoother exterior. And who can say that these pictures are false?

The persons who form the *élite* of London society, the men whose objects are great and whose pursuits are ennobling, the politicians and men of science, the lawyers and physicians, the men of literature and taste, the poets and artists—all these are as much ignored as if the writer were not aware of their existence. The only allusion to such a class is old Osborne's complaint that his daughter, Mrs. Frederic Bullock, 'invites him to meet damned littery men, and keeps the earls and honour-ables to herself.' Vanity Fair is not a fair sample of the London world taken as a whole, but is a not very exaggerated picture of two portions of it.

We have less to say in defence of Pendennis, for there the field is wider, and yet the result is nearly the same. Even in Pendennis, however, though the hero and his friend Warrington are literary men, their literature is of an humble kind. It is not the literature of statesmen, historians, or philosophers, of those who write for the purpose of influencing, or instructing, or improving mankind; it is not the literature of those whose object, though more selfish, is still magnanimous and splendid, of those who aim at widely diffused and permanent fame;—it is the literature of those who write for bread, who use their pens as a labourer does his spade, or a weaver his shuttle. Unless there be some reason for believing that hack writers in general are better than those whom Mr. Thackeray has described, we have no right to quarrel with his descriptions. There are too in Pendennis one or two persons whom we neither laugh at nor hate. There is Laura, who is intelligent and amiable, though indeed she behaves shamefully to the poor girl from the porter's lodge. There is a Mr. Pynsent, in whom there is no harm. There is a Lady Rockminster, who is sensible and kind, though rather *brusque*. In fact, however, we must admit that Pendennis is open to the reproach that it professes to be a fair specimen of English morality, and is not so.

Lastly, Mr. Thackeray is accused of lavishing on his heroines undeserved praise. It is said, that having with great skill put together a creature of which the principal elements are indiscriminating affection, ill-requited devotion, ignorant partiality, a weak will and a narrow intellect, he calls on us to worship his poor idol as the type of female excellence. This is true. Mr. Thackeray does all this; it is one of the greatest blemishes in his books. Happily it is a blemish that can be removed with

ease. Nothing more than a pair of scissors is necessary. Let him carefully cut out every puff which he has wasted on Amelia, and Helen, and Laura, and Rachel; let him leave them, as all the characters in a novel ought to be left, to the reader's un-biassed judgment, and they would take their proper rank among his *dramatis personæ*, though it may differ from that to which their inventor thinks them entitled.

So much for Mr. Thackeray's faults. As to his merits, it is admitted that he is unrivalled by any living writer as an inventor and a describer of character, that he has penetrated into the lowest cells of pride, vanity, and selfishness, and laid open some of the secrets of the human prison-house which never were revealed before. Every reader admires the ease and vigour of his dialogue, its sparkling wit and its humour, sometimes broad, sometimes delicate, but always effective.

The few extracts which we have made from the serious portions of his works are sufficient to show that he has great tragic powers. Nothing can be more exquisitely imagined or described than the parting of George Osborne and Amelia. His natural tendency, however, is towards comedy, or rather towards satire. He

‘Shines in exposing knaves and painting fools.’

But his favourite amusement is the unmasking hypocrisy. He delights to show the selfishness of kindness, the pride of humility, the consciousness of simplicity. If any of Mr. Thackeray's characters had been copied from real life, and the originals could recognise themselves in his imitations, they never would tremble more than when some apparently good act was ascribed to them. They would expect to see in the next page the virtue turn into a vice or a weakness.

Mr. Thackeray, in his English Humourists, resembles little Mr. Thackeray as a satirist. He is as indulgent to his real as he is severe towards his imaginary characters. He treats, indeed, Congreve with superciliousness, and Sterne with contempt almost amounting to disgust, and trembles before the awful phantom of Swift, but embraces all the other spirits that he calls up—Addison, Steele, Prior, Gay, Pope, Hogarth, Smollett, Fielding, and Goldsmith—with the cordiality of a brother in the craft.

When we read the names which Mr. Thackeray has strung together in his list of humourists, we felt some doubt as to his principle of classification, as to the common quality which grouped together writers so different as Pope and Sterne. In

his first lecture Mr. Thackeray professes to point out this common quality:—

‘The humorous writer,’ he says, ‘besides appealing to your sense of ridicule, professes to awaken and direct your love, your pity, your kindness—your scorn for untruth, pretension, imposture—your tenderness for the weak, the poor, the oppressed, the unhappy. To the best of his means and ability he comments on all the ordinary actions and passions of life almost. He takes upon himself to be the week-day preacher, so to speak.’

Now, it is difficult to say what moral writer does not come within so capacious a definition as this. At the head of the humourists of the eighteenth century we should have to put Johnson, Horace Walpole, and Cowper; for never were men who commented more diligently on all the ordinary actions and passions of life, and their comments were deeply tinged with the wisdom resembling absurdity, and the absurdity resembling wisdom, to which we give the name of Humour.

We will not, however, carp any more at Mr. Thackeray's nomenclature. He has given us a set of amusing lectures on interesting persons, and we need not inquire further into his reasons for selecting them. Little new was to be said about Swift after Johnson and Scott, or about Addison after Johnson and Macaulay; but we were glad to see a whole lecture given to Steele, to whose biography less attention has been paid than his amusing chequered character and the great share which he occupies in our earlier English literature deserve.

There occurs, however, in this lecture a passage which leads us to suspect that Mr. Thackeray had not studied, with the attention that his great office requires, all the works of the authors whom he is criticising. He treats the dinner, in the *Polite Conversation*, as a specimen of the habits of the times. ‘Fancy,’ he says, ‘the moral condition of that society in which a lady of fashion provided a great shoulder of veal, a sirloin, a goose, hare, rabbit, chickens, partridges, black puddings, and a ham for a dinner for eight Christians. What—what could have been the condition of that polite world in which people openly ate goose after almond pudding, and took their soup in the middle of dinner?’ (p. 155.) Now, the great Simon Wagstaff, in the preface to his immortal work, has answered all this by anticipation.

‘Some,’ he says, ‘will perhaps object that when I bring my company to dinner I mention too great a variety of dishes, not consistent with the art of cookery, or proper for the season of the year; and *part of the first course is mingled with the second*; besides a failure in politeness by introducing a black

‘pudding to a lord’s table, and at a great entertainment. But if I had omitted the black pudding, what would have become of that exquisite reason given by Miss Notable for not eating it? The world perhaps might have lost it for ever, and I should have been justly answerable. I cannot but hope that such hypercritical readers will please to consider that my business was to make so full and complete a body of refined sayings as compact as I could: only taking care to produce them in the most natural and probable manner, in order to allure my readers into the very substance and marrow of this most admirable and necessary art.’

It is remarkable that, in his notice of Pope, Mr. Thackeray omits the works in which Pope was strictly a humourist, and notices only those in which he was strictly a poet. Now, we sympathise with his admiration of the satire on Addison, and of the conclusion of the *Dunciad*, though we should hesitate before we admitted that in the latter ‘Pope shows himself the equal of all poets of all times.’ But if we had had to point out the work in which the peculiar powers of Pope, and especially his powers as a humourist, shine the brightest, we should have selected not the *Satires*, or the *Dunciad*, but the *Rape of the Lock*.

The best of the lectures is, we think, that on Fielding; and we are delighted to read Mr. Thackeray’s bold and cordial and discriminating praise of this great, but, we fear, somewhat neglected artist; a moralist, from whom the generation that is now passing away imbibed a heartier contempt for meanness and duplicity, and a heartier sympathy with courage, frankness, and manliness, than we fear are to be acquired from the more decorous narratives which form the mental food of their successors.

ART. VII.—1. *Report from the Select Committee on the Office of Speaker; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, &c.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 12th May, 1853.

2. *Returns of the Sitzings of the House of Commons, 1852–53: of the Divisions of the House; Public Bills; Private Bills; Public Committees; and Election Petitions.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th August, 1853.

3. *A practical Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament.* By THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, Esq. Second Edition. London: 1851.

4. *The Rules of Proceeding and Debate in Deliberative Assemblies.* By LUTHER S. CUSHING. Boston: 1853.

WHILE Cabinet Councils, the Press, and the Public are discussing improvements in our representative system, we will venture to solicit attention to another question of public policy—of less political importance, it is true, yet scarcely less concerned in the good government of this country,—we mean the machinery of legislation. The first political object to be desired in a free country, is the best practicable constitution of the legislature; the second, is its successful operation, as shown by good laws, wise councils, fruitful inquiries, and practical efficiency. It is not sufficient to provide for the election of the fittest representatives of the people: but, having been brought together, they must be set to work so as to become efficient instruments of legislation. Organisation is not less essential in a senate than in a factory; and in both alike, however skilful may be the ‘hands,’ their several parts must be nicely adjusted, in order to realise the full results of their combined exertions.

Under a well-ordered system much may be done, even with bad materials. If, according to Horne Tooke’s cynical suggestion, a rope were drawn round the market-place for representatives of the people, political drilling would not be without its benefits. The roughest recruits become in time good soldiers; and Hullah’s pupils, though no musicians, elicited the highest praise of the great Duke, who had never seen ‘such discipline in ‘his life.’ What, then, may not be expected from the organised and well-directed energies of the chosen men of our Senate—enlightened, capable, and ambitious?

And truly there is enough for them to do! Never were so many important functions combined in a deliberative assembly, as in the British Parliament. Our legislation has become the most difficult and complicated of human labours; and the utmost facilities which experience can suggest, will merely afford a slight alleviation of its pressure. Happy were our German ancestors in their simple assemblies! A few of their leaders made short speeches, to which their audience responded in a manner very significant, but, according to our notions, somewhat disorderly. ‘Si displicuit sententia, fremitu adspernantur: ‘sin placuit, frameas concutunt.’ Weary debates, from night till morning, under the glare of Bude lights, are amongst the discoveries as well as penalties of modern civilisation.

So many circumstances have contributed to enlarge the powers and increase the activity of Parliament, that of late years it has been continually working at ‘high pressure.’ A vast arrear of

legislation had long been accumulating upon us. After a century of inaction, and three and twenty years of war, the statesmen of our own time have had to do the work of many generations—to unmake as well as to make laws—to detect and expose abuses—to break down monopolies—to bear up against corrupt interests—to resist prejudices which had long been sanctioned by our laws—and to adopt higher principles and a wiser policy. But much as they have had to accomplish—and however speedily and well it has sometimes been done—the necessities of our age and country have still been in advance of their utmost endeavours. A new life has grown up in the British Empire and people. In population, wealth, enterprise, and commerce, in science and the arts, in political enlightenment, in moral and social advancement, our progress has been without a parallel in the history of the world. And while the requirements of an advancing society have demanded the aids of sound legislation, our popular institutions and a free press have caused an extraordinary strain upon the Legislature. And well and wisely, on the whole, has Parliament met the increasing demands upon its energies. The history of England since the Peace, not written by Alison, or any pseudo-philosopher of his school, is creditable to the sagacity of our statesmen, and the enlightened wisdom of the Legislature. Generally keeping pace with the spirit of the times—sometimes being even in advance of it, as in the repeal of the Catholic disabilities—they have, at the same time, resisted changes, however strongly urged, which were not consistent with the general policy of our institutions.

Satisfactory as we must pronounce the general results of our legislation to have been*; yet, when we observe, from day to day, the process by which they are practically wrought out, we cannot help wondering that they should ever have been accomplished. The political difficulties of legislation in a popular assembly are sufficiently great; but when to these are added a defective organisation, an insufficient division of labour, and indefinite facilities for obstructive debate, they can only be overcome by such struggles and sacrifices as ought not to be exacted of those who devote themselves to the public service. The process of legislation has not kept pace with its increasing requirements. 'We have outgrown our forms,' said Sir John Pakington, in the last Session; and we trust that Parliament will subscribe to his opinion.

The antiquity of our Parliamentary forms, and the almost

* For a summary of the Recent Progress of Legislation see the *Edinburgh Review*, No. xciii. Art. 3.

unvarying steadiness with which they have been observed, for at least three centuries, is a remarkable feature of our Constitution. Precedents for most of the proceedings of both Houses may be found in the very first volumes of their journals, recorded in a language, now quaint and obsolete; but outliving, by the mere force of usage, our written laws, and passing unscathed through civil wars and revolutions. There is a dignity as well as merit in this force of ancient custom, which secures a more willing and reverential obedience, than any modern rules or bye-laws. In the House of Commons the cry of 'order' has a prescriptive authority, while in other assemblies it is more often the signal for confusion. But this reverence for custom is not without its evils. Politicians of every shade had long agreed in regarding the British Constitution with pride, until the veneration of many had degenerated into fanaticism. It was 'holy ground,' and all around and about it was holy. And everything seemed to be near it, and to concern it. To disfranchise a corrupt borough, to reform a corporation, to repeal the duty on corn, or to leave off hanging men for sheep-stealing, were all 'inroads upon our glorious Constitution,' until the phrase could scarcely be repeated without a smile. And thus has it been with our Parliamentary customs, which are a part of the Constitution. We have been proud of them,—and with good cause. We have seen them adopted—often to the very letter—in every deliberative assembly in the world; in France, Belgium, the United States of America, and all the British Colonies. Their adoption elsewhere is partly due to their own proved excellence, and partly to the *prestige* attaching, in every free country, to British institutions. But here again, the true faith has not been unmingled with idolatry; and to discontinue an old form was to cast down an idol. With the exception of the daily distribution of the printed Votes and Proceedings, for which we are mainly indebted to the zeal of the late Mr. Rickman, we cannot recall a single change, of any importance, in Parliamentary practice, before the Reform Act. In matters of form the Commons had almost exposed themselves to Napoleon's sarcasm upon the Bourbons;—'*Ils n'ont rien appris,—ils n'ont rien oublié.*'

An example of this continued reluctance to change may be found in the Report on the office of Speaker, which we have placed at the head of this Article. In 1606, the House, having suffered inconvenience from the absence of their Speaker, appointed a committee to search for precedents; 'thereby the better to direct themselves what were meet to be done hereafter, upon all occasions of the Speaker's absence, by sickness

‘or otherwise.’ The Speaker, however, recovered; and the Committee of 1853 express their regret ‘that the Committee (of 1606,) which had been appointed to consider the very same matters which, after a lapse of nearly 250 years, have now been referred to your Committee, made no report to the House.’ That is to say, for 250 years nothing had been done to prevent the recurrence of an evil, which during that time had frequently been experienced. And, true to the instinct of the House of Commons, the Committee now approach the subject with ‘great caution’ and ‘apprehension’; offering, as one of their reasons for recommending the least possible change, ‘the reluctance apparently entertained by the House, in former times,’ to do anything that was necessary in the matter. And so it has been on other occasions.

Some statesmen have been foremost in opposing changes in the procedure of Parliament, while others have regarded them with indifference; caring little to understand them, and undervaluing their political importance. Of all our public men who have concerned themselves with this department of Parliamentary Reform, the present Speaker stands preeminent. Fitted by his talents and qualified by his previous training and acquirements, Mr. Shaw Lefevre was marked out for the high office to which he was elected. An active county member, an experienced and able magistrate, — he soon became known as an unrivalled chairman of Parliamentary Committees. Here he displayed the conspicuous talents, judgment, tact, and urbanity, for which he has since been distinguished on a wider and more honourable field. His eminent services in the chair are universally acknowledged. The Commons are justly proud of the Speaker of their choice, and respect his authority with a willing obedience; but few of them are aware of his unceasing exertions, behind the scenes, to facilitate their proceedings, and smooth the numerous difficulties by which they are beset. With a genius for active business, he was not long in discovering where the Commons ‘had outgrown their forms.’ Having mastered the dry technicalities of Parliamentary procedure, so as never to be at fault, he watched their practical operation with a critical eye; and with singular judgment, prudence, and sagacity has striven to introduce every practicable improvement. More useful changes have been made during the fourteen years of his Speakership, than in the time, we will make bold to say, of any three of his predecessors.

And here we would observe that, in such matters, the Speaker’s position is one of considerable delicacy. In expounding and giving effect to existing rules, his authority is paramount; but

new rules can only be made by the House, in which, strange as it may appear, though Speaker, he has himself no voice. It is only by his personal influence with other members, and by the weight attached to his opinions, whether expressed in private, or stated in evidence before Committees, that he is able to promote any change which he may think desirable. Hence he is constrained to a cautious reserve in committing himself to opinions, which he pronounces without authority, and the adoption of which he is unable further to advocate. Moreover, upon questions of this description the Government is ordinarily passive; and the House, being left without any moving power, is languid and indifferent. Nor is it usual to press forward any proposition of the kind, except with the general concurrence of experienced members, on both sides of the House. Sometimes, also, it is advisable to ascertain the feeling of the House of Lords before any change is proposed, and even to induce them to originate it. Thus while proposals, to which he stands committed, are exposed to numerous chances of failure, the Speaker is often deprived of the credit of having himself suggested acceptable improvements. But none of these discouragements have deterred Mr. Speaker Lefevre from promoting all reasonable amendments in the proceedings of Parliament, with unwearied perseverance, until, sooner or later, he has succeeded in carrying them into effect. To some of these successful experiments we shall have occasion to allude, in reference to other beneficial changes, by which we hope the remaining years of his Speakership will be signalised.

In order to estimate the importance of an efficient organisation of the labours of Parliament, it will be necessary to pass them under review, to point out their extent and variety, and to explain the arduous duties and engagements of its members. As the main burden of public business falls upon the House of Commons, our attention will be more particularly directed to its proceedings. Of its labours and endurance the last Session will supply numerous illustrations.

The Parliament was assembled on the 4th Nov. 1852, and was prorogued on the 20th August, 1853. The leaves of autumn had not fallen when it met; the leaves of another summer had begun to fall, before it had concluded its laborious sittings. The Session extended over a period of 290 days; during which the House of Commons sat, for despatch of business, 160 days, and was occupied 1193 hours, 14 minutes; of which, 133½ hours were after midnight. The average of each day's sitting was rather less than 7½ hours; but a glance at Mr.

Brotherton's detailed return * will fall upon a column, showing that upon numerous occasions, during the last two months of the Session, the House continued sitting for upwards of 15 hours out of the 24! For example, on the 5th July, the House met at 12 o'clock, and adjourned on the following morning at $\frac{1}{4}$ before 4, having divided no less than five times after midnight, upon Mr. Keating's ill-timed motion on Dockyard Promotions. And on several other days the House met at 12, and, with a suspension of business for two hours only in the afternoon, adjourned between 3 and 4 o'clock on the following morning.

The bare statement of these unseasonable hours suggests feelings of weariness and exhaustion. What Court could administer justice, with temper, for fourteen hours? Where are the men of business who could usefully confer upon their own affairs, for so many hours? Even the poor literary drudge, writing for his daily bread, would fail under labours so long sustained. Yet members of Parliament are found to endure them, month after month, and the public rarely hear of their sufferings. Occasionally, however, a voice breaks forth beyond their walls, and reveals the secrets of the prison-house. Let it tell its own tale.

On the 28th July,

'The Clerk was proceeding at half-past one o'clock to read the remaining orders of the day, twenty-eight in number, when—

'Mr. Brotherton, amid cheering from all sides of the House, rose and moved that the House do now adjourn. He protested against going into the consideration of new bills at that time of night. He had abstained of late from interfering to move the adjournment of the House, because he considered that he might as well attempt to stop the tide. He had for twenty years perseveringly endeavoured to bring the House to observe reasonable hours. The attempt was now beyond his strength: but he really hoped that next Session some measure would be adopted to prevent a repetition of such late sittings. The House had now been sitting thirteen hours and a half. This might be done now and then; but when, as had frequently happened of late, the House sat fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen hours, the labour was beyond what human nature could endure.' (From the *Times*, 29th July, 1853.)

The Members cheered, the clerk read the next order of the day, and the House, not profiting by the counsels of their faithful monitor, continued sitting till a quarter past three in the morning!

* Sitzings of the House, 1852-53, No. 945. of sess. 1853.

Again, on the 5th of August, in Committee of Supply, at nearly one in the morning —

‘Mr. Wilkinson appealed to the Government not to press them so hard. ‘The House ought really to *strike for shorter hours of labour*.’

‘Mr. Hume said he must insist on the motion for reporting progress. He was obliged to leave the House last night at one o’clock. He could stand it no longer!’

Nor was the last Session exceptional and unprecedented. The Session of 1847–48 exceeded it in length by three days, and still more in the number and duration of its sittings; the House having sat on 170 days and for 1407 hours, or ten days and 214 hours more than in the last Session. And even in other Sessions, less remarkable for their duration, it will be found that the sittings of the House have been not much less protracted. For example, in 1834 the House sat on 140 days and for 1187 hours; in 1842, on 125 days and for 1008 hours; in 1845, on 119 days and for 1026 hours; and in 1850, on 129 days and for 1104 hours. In these four, and some intermediate Sessions, the average duration of the daily sittings exceeded that of the last Session, amounting to between eight and nine hours. Long and heavy Sessions have become the rule, and Sessions of even moderate length, the rare exception. The Committee on the office of Speaker calculate the sittings of the House during the present Speakership, as upwards of 13,000 hours, of which 1196 have been after midnight; and conclude, from an examination of the Journals, that already more business has been transacted in his time than during the entire period of any previous Speaker. Assuredly the Speaker will be able to give a good account of his stewardship.

If the late Session had been even longer than it was, its protracted sittings would have been justified by the extraordinary number and importance of its measures; but, generally, the length of the Session is no criterion of the business transacted. On the contrary, in the House of Commons, as elsewhere, idleness being ‘the root of all evil,’ sets loose every tongue, and encourages unprofitable, if not mischievous discussion. The more there is to do, the less will time be wasted: and no expedient can be suggested, so efficacious in restraining the abuses of Parliamentary debate, as a large budget of measures submitted; at an early period, by the Government, and distributed equally over the entire Session. And while a feeble and inert Government provokes opposition, a strong and active Government quells it in Parliament, and discourages it in the country. A strong Government, therefore, is equally desirable for facili-

tating practical legislation, as for other political objects; and the fruitful Session of 1853 was due to an Administration combining every political and personal element of strength, and using its power for the best and most practical purposes.

But with all political facilities for good legislation, can it be necessary that Parliament should be occupied so large a proportion of every year, straining to do its appointed work, and yet leaving much undone? Is it fitting that the legislature of an old country, with long-established institutions, and defined principles of law, should be as much engaged, year after year, in deliberating upon new laws, as if it were the Constituent Assembly of a Model Republic, having institutions and laws to create out of political chaos? Here there is little to construct, though much to repair, improve, and finish. And to do this work, Parliament has at its command the most advanced political science, enlightened public opinion, and all the practical ability and experience of the nation. With these aids to legislation, a strong Government, apart from political obstacles, ought to experience little difficulty in the enactment of good laws. No facility should be conceded, if inconsistent with the fullest publicity and ample means of discussion; but expedients may be devised for simplifying the process of legislation, and, at the same time, improving its character.

On account of the great length of some of the Parliamentary Debates, it is very commonly supposed that discussion, followed by small results, forms the main business of the House of Commons; whereas, by far the larger part of its business is transacted with little or no discussion. In the last Session, there were 11,378 entries in the votes, of orders made, bills read, committees appointed, and other proceedings of the House; and probably not more than a twentieth part of them were debated. Many of them could scarcely have been sufficiently considered, while hundreds of questions, proposed for consideration, failed to obtain a hearing. The 'Votes and Proceedings' of a single day have sometimes amounted to a volume. On the morning of the 20th of April last, the Votes and Supplementary Papers delivered to Members extended to no less than 84 folio pages—being equal to an octavo volume of 168 pages; and again, on the 23rd July, they contained 80 folio pages, or 160 octavo pages.

On turning to the list of business appointed for each day, the hopelessness of attempting to dispose of it, is immediately apparent. To select a few of the most remarkable days: on the 21st July, there were 33 orders of the day, and 79 notices of motions; on the 22nd, 23 orders of the day, and 72 notices of

motions; and on the 29th, 25 orders of the day, and 73 notices of motions. It should, perhaps, be explained to the uninitiated, that orders of the day have already been appointed for consideration, by the House itself; and that notices are given by individual Members, with a vain hope of being able to submit to the House propositions of their own.

On some days, in addition to an extraordinary list of business for the House itself, there were no less than 30, 32, and even 33 committees sitting for four or five hours in the morning; and in which upwards of 200 Members were engaged.

The pressure of committee business upon the Members of the House was unusually severe during the last Session. There were no less than 49 Election Committees, consisting of five Members, which sat, upon an average, for $5\frac{1}{2}$ days each. Of these, the Chatham, the Cork, and the Clitheroe cases each occupied 14 days, and the Liverpool case 21. There were 51 Public Committees, consisting generally of about 15 Members, but, in many instances, of a much greater number. As many as 31 Members served on the Irish Tenant Right Committee, and 38 on the Committee on Indian Territories. The latter sat 46 days, the Railways' Committee 40 days, and the Committee on Public Petitions 87 days. There were also 44 committees on opposed Private Bills, many of which were occupied for several weeks, as well as 119 committees on unopposed Private Bills. The aggregate number of these committees amounted to 263.

The assembling of these numerous committees, and of the crowds repairing to them, is a stirring sight. It should be viewed in Barry's noble octagon Hall, which may be termed the political centre of the British Empire. Midway between the two Houses, and common to them both, it is the central chamber whence all the communications of the vast Palace of Westminster diverge. Straight through it, the Queen on her throne, in the House of Peers, may see the Speaker, in his chair in the House of Commons; and, as if to illustrate the quick pulsations of our political system, here is the Electric Telegraph, reporting events as they occur within these busy precincts, and speeding them far and near with its magic wires.

Here, then, let us take our stand, and watch the moving groups as they pass on. They form a panorama of English society, in which representatives of every class are exhibited. Among the Members are many whose names are 'familiar as household words:' but they are soon lost in the pressing throng. There are counsel, attorneys, and civil engineers—mayors, aldermen, town-councillors, and town-clerks—directors,

secretaries, and shareholders — clerks and short-hand writers, — election agents, publicans, and incorruptible voters — pilots and harbour-masters — general officers and Parsee merchants — dignitaries of the Church and dissenting ministers — farmers and cotton-spinners. But when will they all have passed under review? Their numbers and variety proclaim the imperial attributes of Parliament, which has gathered them together.

Various as these groups, are the jurisdiction and inquiries of the committees whose sittings they are about to attend. The rooms in which they assemble are approached by a corridor upwards of 600 feet long; and every room, throughout its length, has its Court of Inquiry and its audience, or eager expectants outside its doors. In one, the government of our Indian Empire is investigated; in another, the clauses of a Turnpike Bill discussed. The largest principles of public policy, and the most petty details of local administration — subjects for the deliberations of a Cabinet Council, and of a parish vestry, are here alike considered. At the same time, judicial inquiries are proceeding, by which public and private interests, and often the character of the parties concerned, are more largely affected than by the decisions of all the Judges in Westminster Hall.

Day after day the members of committees are occupied with these absorbing duties, in addition to their laborious attendance upon the sittings of the House itself. A few minutes before four o'clock they are released from the committee rooms by the welcome announcement that 'Mr. Speaker is at prayers,' and hasten to the meeting of the House.

And now begins the proper business of the day, which is as remarkable for its variety and miscellaneous character as for its extent and duration. Petitions are presented, reports brought up, private bills advanced a stage, and sometimes discussed, returns ordered, notices given, and lastly before the commencement of the debates of the evening, questions are addressed to Ministers of the Crown.

This political catechism has become one of our popular institutions. Without the formality of a debate, every matter supposed to be of public interest is brought under notice, and the opinions of the Government promptly elicited. While it is of the highest value in awakening the attention of the House and public opinion, it increases the responsibility and strengthens the hands of the Executive. But questions put merely to satisfy curiosity or attract personal notice are so frequent, that the advantages of the interrogatory privilege are apt to be overlooked. It would seem to be the chief amusement of some members diligently to read

the newspapers in the morning, and to ask Ministers of State in the afternoon, if they have read them too, and what they think about them. And in order to be prepared to answer such questions (often fitter for the club window than the Senate) the Minister must devote himself to newspaper literature as well as to state-papers. The happy facility with which Lord Palmerston would turn the laugh against his questioners has often formed an agreeable prelude to the graver and more wearisome business of the evening.

When all questions are exhausted, the House proceeds to the regular business appointed for the day, often of a character as miscellaneous as the questions. No classification of subjects is attempted. When Government measures are entitled to precedence, they are, indeed, arranged with a view to facilitate the general progress of business; but at other times, the arrangement is literally left to chance, the precedence of motions being determined by ballot. Nor is Government business always free from the intrusion of other debateable topics: for whenever the Committee of Supply is appointed to sit, it challenges the proposal of a medley of chance motions. The 2nd of August last affords a good illustration of this practice. The business appointed for that day was the Committee of Supply; but in the votes appeared twelve different notices of motions, or amendments to be proposed before going into committee. They related to 'the Dublin Hospitals,' 'the Kafir war,' 'arterial drainage in Ireland,' 'the Royal Geographical Society,' 'the Norwich election petition,' 'the annexation of Pegu,' 'the Metropolitan Police,' 'the diocese of Bath and Wells,' 'the Postal arrangements at Stoke-upon-Trent,' 'the Parsee merchants Jevangee Merjee, and Pestongee Merjee,' 'the state of the Metropolitan Bridges,' and 'the conduct of the East India Company towards the Carnatic stipendiaries.'

The multitude of minor subjects, introduced independently of the general business of legislation, cannot fail to have been noticed. The columns of advertisements, in the daily papers, are scarcely more diversified than the columns of Parliamentary debates. A cabman at Bow Street, a pauper at Lewisham, a maniac at Colney Hatch — each in their turn — within a week occupied the attention of the 'Grand Inquest of the Nation.' Like the elephant's trunk, which, having uprooted a forest-tree, can pick up a pin, this potent and flexible instrument of popular government, having provided for the government of India, demands fair play between Mr. Serjeant Adams and the termagant who had called the policeman at Clerkenwell 'a pig.'

Many evils result from this confusion of subjects and this absence of classification. The Government measures are retarded, not so much by the discussion to which they naturally give rise, as by the continual intrusion of other subjects of debate. This delay is often a serious inconvenience, more particularly in regard to financial and fiscal questions which require a speedy determination; and as the cause is in constant operation, it at length affects so many measures, that the general business of the Session is unduly postponed. The Government bills are contending with one another for advancement, and some are kept waiting for months, without making any progress. And while the Government are thus embarrassed, the members who have contributed to the delay, are themselves exposed to continual disappointment. Week after week the motions they have been anxious to bring forward are postponed, until speeches composed for the occasion are forgotten, or dressed up again for some other debate. The more pertinacious endeavour to obtain an irregular hearing on motions for adjournment, or on going into Committee of Supply, and thus increase the general delay; while those who value the convenience of the House more than their own voices, throw up the game with as good a grace as may be. For any Member, unconnected with the Government, to succeed in passing a measure of his own, has long been regarded as nearly hopeless.

These difficulties are aggravated by the unequal pressure of business upon the House of Commons. Often when that House is sitting night and day, to the distress of Mr. Brotherton, it has been observed by an irreverent wit, that the Lords sit scarcely long enough to boil an egg. This inequality arises, in some measure, from the privileges of the Commons, by which all bills are required to originate with them, which impose a burden upon the people; and it is much to be desired, that some arrangement could be made, by which a larger proportion of bills might originate in the House of Lords. With this object, a partial relaxation of their privileges was agreed to by the Commons in 1849; and the propriety of making some further concessions is worthy of their consideration. At the same time, it must be confessed that the ill-advised attempt of the Opposition Peers to amend the Succession Duty Bill—in open violation of the undoubted privileges of the Commons—does not encourage such concessions.

But political causes contribute more to this unequal pressure upon the two Houses than the stumbling-block of privilege. On the 14th of April, 1848, Lord Stanley, after adverting to the inconveniences arising from the inaction of the House of Lords

in the early part of the Session, and the undue pressure upon it at the conclusion, encouraged a relaxation of the privileges of the Commons with a view to the introduction of a greater number of Bills into the House of Lords; but at the same time he added:—

‘He had remarked that, as a general rule, Bills originating in their Lordships’ House were not always received with great favour by the other branch. He had observed, that whether from the non-publication of their Lordships’ Papers, or the scanty attendance of their Lordships not attracting public attention, undoubtedly it often happened that measures which passed that House with apparent unanimity, and without exciting any objection out of doors, were made the subject of severe contest and strong animadversion when they reached the other House. He would, therefore, as a general rule, infinitely prefer that Bills should come in the first instance from the House of Commons, believing that the more proper function of their Lordships was to control, amend, and revise the legislation of the House of Commons.’

Sir Robert Peel, we believe, entertained the same opinion; and it can scarcely be doubted, that whether the Commons should ever think it prudent to relax their privileges or not, the great burden of legislation will inevitably continue to press upon the most powerful and popular branch of the Parliament. The representative body is in close communication with the people, and gives expression to public opinion; its proceedings are observed with universal interest; and, being the dominant power in the State, its views of public policy are ordinarily decisive. The Upper House, on the other hand, though abounding in men of the highest talents and individual popularity, is constitutionally independent of public opinion; it has no recognised modes of communication with constituencies and the people; and its political weight being inferior to that of the Commons, its voice is less potential in regard to the ultimate success of measures discussed in Parliament. For these reasons, the Commons must generally be the originating and motive, and the Lords the controlling, power in the State; and the pressure upon the former is a political necessity, to be reckoned among the difficulties of every succeeding Session.

As the end of the Session approaches, the result of accumulated delays becomes conspicuous. It seems as if all the work of the Session were still to be done. Every one has been harassed and overtaken; but when will the Session be over? On Monday, the 8th of August last, when Parliament had been sitting for nine months, there were still forty-seven Public Bills before the Commons, in different stages, to be considered before

the Session could be brought to a close. And so it has been in former years, until the evil has become chronic, and, under the present system, incurable. The bills which have thus accumulated are either hurried through, at last, without proper consideration, and sent up, in the last fortnight, to the Lords, who had been sitting for months with folded arms; or, after having occupied much time, and given occasion to numerous debates, are ultimately abandoned. Both these inconveniences have been constant subjects of complaint, particularly in the House of Lords.

The Government of India Bill, in the last Session, having been nineteen days under discussion in the House of Commons, between the 4th of June and the 29th of July, at length reached the House of Lords, where the second reading was appointed for the 6th of August. On that occasion, Lord Malmesbury complained that there were '42 bills before their Lordships, and 31 coming up from the House of Commons—making 73 bills to be considered during a fortnight;' and as regards the India Bill itself, he said that it had reached the Lords at a time 'when it was physically impossible for any other party, except that of the Government, to collect a sufficient number of Peers to discuss the question as it ought to be discussed.'

To these observations Lord Aberdeen replied:—

'Now, my Lords, as to the period of the Session at which this Bill comes before you, I must confess that long as I have been a member of this House—and I have been a member longer than any of your Lordships now present—*this is a complaint that I have never ceased to hear at the close of every Session.* I admit that, on many occasions, that complaint has been made with great truth and justice.'

Nor is Lord Aberdeen the only Premier who has made such admissions. In 1848, Lord Stanley pointed out, very forcibly, the extent of the inconvenience, and proposed, as a remedy, to enable the Lords to suspend a bill from one Session to another, and, in the meantime, to refer it to a competent legal adviser. A Bill to effect this object was brought in by his Lordship, to which the Lords agreed, though not without the suggestion of several objections. In the Commons, however, not being very favourably received, it was allowed to drop. Propositions of this kind, indeed, are to be viewed in their political bearings, rather than as matters of Parliamentary form. Lord Campbell had pointed out that, 'the proposed change might be sometimes employed as a strong argument in the hands of an Opposition, for the postponement of a measure which it might be of the

‘utmost importance to pass speedily; and it was obvious that there might be great change of circumstances in the interval between one Session and another.’ Pretexts for delay are generally plausible, and, to timid minds, much more acceptable than direct objections to the merits of a measure itself. And thus, if the forms of the House permitted it, a subtle opponent might be able to unite a majority in agreeing to the postponement of a measure, where he would fail in an attempt to secure its rejection.

So long as the business of a Session is accomplished at last — no matter with what inconvenience and confusion — it may be said that the public interests do not suffer. The work is done, and we need not concern ourselves with the manner of doing it. Nothing can be further from the truth. Every Session witnesses many important measures necessarily abandoned by the Government for want of time. This sacrifice, which has been facetiously described as ‘The Massacre of the Innocents,’ had become so frequent under Lord Melbourne’s Administration, that Lord Lyndhurst was able to vex the Government and delight the Opposition with a long list of the victims, whose untimely fate he wittily described at the end of every Session. A still greater number of measures are withheld, lest they should impede the progress of those which have been already introduced. It is true that they are, for the most part, merely postponed until another year; yet, admitting the philosophy of the maxim, that no good law is ever propounded which does not, sooner or later, take effect, such postponements are inconvenient and often hazardous. It is surely desirable to legislate for our own times rather than for posterity; but a generation is sometimes allowed to pass away before a measure, of which the principle has been favourably regarded, is successfully carried into effect. The Charitable Trusts Bill, originally proposed by Lord Brougham in 1816, has at length become law in 1853; and Lord John Russell, in adverting to this circumstance, observed, with as much truth as humour, that this was ‘about the ordinary period for bringing any considerable measure to maturity.’ The justice of his remark is also exemplified by the history of the Bills for establishing County Courts and the Registration of Assurances.

The long delay of such measures is, doubtless, to be ascribed to other causes—as, for example, to an unformed or inactive public opinion, and the opposition of powerful interests—as well as to obstacles of a more formal character. Each succeeding Session, however, has its own pressure of political questions, by which measures of inferior public interest are set aside, until

changes of Government—changes in the constitution of the House itself,—and new subjects to occupy the minds of the people, may endanger the success of good laws, which, with better opportunities, might sooner have been brought to maturity.

Nor is the enumeration of evils arising from the chance-medley of Parliamentary business yet exhausted. The pressure of the work is so great and so long continued, that towards the conclusion of the Session, when the greater part of the business still remains to be done, an irritable impatience is apt to take possession of the calmest minds, and steady judgment gives way to haste and indifference. Hence many of the grave defects which are found in our Statutes, to the injury of the public, and the discredit of the Legislature. How can it be otherwise? The Bills must be passed, somehow or other: the Session advances, but they make no progress, till at length the time arrives when, in the words of Sir Francis Baring, ‘any man who occupies the time of the House is a public enemy;’ and then they are hustled through, with amendments hastily made, or impatiently rejected. To pass a Bill at all is now the object; and the form in which it passes is of little moment. And this, after sitting several months for eight hours a day, with numerous Committees aiding the House in its labours, and all the ablest practical minds in the country brought together for the public good! If Parliament were assembled for no more than a month, this journey-work, with such materials, would scarcely be excused. How much longer, then, is it to be borne, with a Parliament having more than sufficient time, not shrinking from its task, and working with abundant means at its command? The defective organisation, of which we complain, amounts to a grave political evil, the practical correction of which would be a worthy achievement for the first statesmen of our age.

The postponement of measures, to the very end of the Session, is attended with this further evil, that it becomes no longer possible to obtain the true sentiments of Parliament. The London season is over, and the centrifugal force of pleasure and fashion has become irresistible. The continent, the watering-places, and the moors, have thinned the senatorial ranks, and left the field in possession of the Government and a small body of volunteers. The House, it is true, now becomes more manageable; the few skirmishers being rarely a match for the regular forces of the Government. Yet no reliance is to be placed upon the result of a division in a thin House; and it may be well to notice that the only two defeats sustained by the Go-

vernment, in passing their India Bill, occurred on its last stages, at the end of July.

All the inconveniences we have enumerated, as well as some others which we will not pause to notice, have long been acknowledged by those who are conversant with the practical working of the Parliamentary system. But it may be asked — are they not inseparable from the very nature of our free Parliament, and the plain result of its freedom of speech and unlimited jurisdiction? That the practical administration of affairs, in so popular an assembly, will always be exposed to many difficulties, is not open to dispute; but the particular evils under consideration are independent, in great measure, of the political constitution of Parliament, and are susceptible, if not of cure, at least of considerable mitigation. So much advantage has already been derived from changes of procedure which have attracted little attention, that sanguine anticipations may be formed of future improvements. It is understood that, in the approaching Session, a Committee will be appointed to consider every practical suggestion for facilitating the despatch of business; and we should be glad to see its deliberations anticipated by a general expression of public opinion in favour of the adoption of a more effective machinery for legislation.

A detailed examination of the experiments already made, and of further improvements suggested, would scarcely be acceptable to the readers of this Journal; but, without exhausting their patience, we may venture to indicate the principles which, in our opinion, ought to be carried into effect, and at least to glance at several specific recommendations which seem more particularly worthy of consideration.

No man of business will dispute the maxim, that, in conducting affairs, we should first settle what is to be done, and then proceed to do it. In practice, however, this maxim had been so continually disregarded in the House of Commons, that it became absolutely necessary to secure its more general recognition. No long time ago, every order of the day was subject to the interposition of irrelevant motions and debates. This irrational practice was subjected to considerable restriction in 1837; but it was reserved to the present Speaker to make the reading of an order of the day by the clerk, like the calling on of a cause in Court. No sooner is it read, than it is entered upon without any interlocutory discussion being permitted. The principle of this rule has been carried out, at his suggestion, with such signal advantage in the case of Committees of the whole House, as to require particular mention. Until 1849, whenever the House was about to resolve itself into Committee upon a Bill

or other matter, obstructive amendments could be interposed, and debates renewed, again and again, upon questions already affirmed by the House. This abuse, which was at variance with the spirit and intention of Parliamentary rules, has been corrected; and now, when any matter has once been considered in Committee, and stands for further consideration, the Speaker forthwith leaves the chair, with an alacrity that evinces his appreciation of the rule to which he is giving effect.

The value of this rule may best be elucidated by a recent example. Our readers will not soon forget Mr. Gladstone's 'Budget' of 1853. Introduced by a speech of five hours' duration, which established his position in the first rank of statesmen and debaters, its great financial and fiscal schemes demanded an entire Session for their development. No less than twenty-seven distinct measures were founded upon it; which, by the rules of the House, were required to be first considered in Committee. No ordinary Session would have been sufficient to bring such a code of laws to maturity, if, day after day, the going into Committee for their consideration could have been retarded by incidental discussions. But, dexterously availing himself of the protection afforded by the new rule, Mr. Gladstone secured the appointment of one Committee for the consideration of the 'Customs, &c. Acts,' on which the greater part of his measures were founded; and no sooner had this Committee once entered upon its labours, than its repeated sittings were free from further interruption. No better illustration is wanting, of the political importance which may attach to a technical rule. Never were statesman-like views of public policy wrought out with more inflexible resolution than by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Ready at all points—never at fault either for facts or argument—seizing upon every opportunity to press forward the work he had undertaken,—he would yet have been powerless against the formal obstructions to which, under other circumstances, he might have been exposed. He had difficulties enough to contend with; and, in his race against time, any further obstacles would have been fatal. Either a part of his Budget must have been ultimately abandoned, or else other more important measures of the Government, which were continually thwarting him with unexpected delays, must have been postponed until another year. In either case, the political success of the last Session would have been rendered less complete, by a cause so insignificant, that it would scarcely have been detected by many of the statesmen who would have suffered from its operation.

An exception to this wholesome rule has still been retained, as regards the Committees of Supply, and Ways and Means; and

we have already noticed the heterogeneous collection of motions and amendments for which these Committees are consequently responsible. Day after day, when the proper business of the House is to consider the revenue and expenditure of the country, these frivolous questions are forced upon its notice, against the will of nine-tenths of its members. And this anomaly has been permitted in deference to the constitutional maxim—with which it is supposed to have some connexion—that the redress of grievances is to precede the grant of subsidies to the Crown. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this principle was first asserted, when Parliaments were summoned for no other purpose than the levy of taxes upon the people, and were dismissed as soon as the subsidies had been granted. The redress of grievances, therefore, could only be pressed upon the notice of the Crown, at the first assembling of a Parliament. To have parted with their money first, and then to have demanded favours, would indeed have been an odd method of striking a bargain; and the sagacity of our ancestors, sharpened by experience, led them to get whatever they could for themselves, before they agreed to be stripped of their ‘brief authority’ by the grant of a subsidy. Nor was the principle less vital to our Constitution, in later times, when a perpetual contest was waged between the Crown and the Parliament. We may be said to have bought our liberties with hard cash. When the Crown was not reduced by its necessities to demand a subsidy, no Parliament was summoned; when it could hold out no longer, this dreaded power was again called into activity, and, purse in hand, it wrung from unwilling and treacherous kings, the liberties of the people. Even now the same principle secures, with a force greater than that of any Statute, the annual meeting and uninterrupted deliberations of Parliament. The supplies are granted by annual votes, and are never finally appropriated to the service of the year, till the very last day of the Session.

How, then, would this principle, which is, in truth, the foundation of Parliamentary government, be endangered by restrictions upon the untimely discussion of matters wholly unconnected with either grievances or finance? It is not protection against the Crown that is wanting, but protection for the House of Commons, against its own members. The only result of the present license of debate is, that less vigilance is exercised in controlling public expenditure, than is devoted to the scrutiny of a Private Bill. The voting of the supplies is postponed till the very end of the Session; and is at last hurried over by the few remaining Members, in whom a sense of public duty has not given way before the pressure of fatigue and

private convenience. We would, therefore, apply the same rule to the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means as to other committees. Let them be appointed to sit at convenient times, and permit no interruption to their sittings. This change, however, should be accompanied by the concession of other facilities for bringing on motions, at more convenient times.

To complete the prohibition of interruptions to the appointed business of the day, one further regulation will be necessary. For many years past, Saturday has been observed as a day of rest for the House and its Committees — a Parliamentary Sabbath, as it were—for its overtaken members. It is not broken in upon more than two or three times in the course of a Session. Yet because it was formerly the custom to sit on Saturday, except by a special adjournment, the formal motion to adjourn from Friday till Monday has still been continued. On such a question there is not likely to be any difference of opinion; nor, indeed, can anything be said about it; but an obsolete form is rarely without its mischief, and accordingly it has become the occasion for an irregular debate upon every conceivable topic except the adjournment, to which it professes to relate. This abuse has met with so much discouragement from the present Speaker,* that it is no longer so flagrant as we remember it to have been; but it should be prevented altogether. The remedy is obvious. Let the House resolve to sit on Saturday when necessary; and, at other times, let the adjournment be a matter of course. Mr. Bouverie was about to make this proposition at the end of last Session, but desisted, lest it should give rise to a debate, which at that time was, above all things, to be avoided.

When, by these changes, the certainty of the appointed business being considered at the proper time, has been ensured, precautions should be taken to secure the debates which follow, from unseasonable interruptions. It was suggested by the Speaker, in 1848*, that questions of adjournment should be decided without debate, and that a repetition of such questions, within an hour after a decision of the House, should be prohibited. And as even divisions alone, without debate, are very vexatious when persisted in by a small minority, he proposed that they should not be allowable, unless demanded by at least twenty-one members.

As the rules of the British Parliament were adopted in the United States and in France, it is not without instruction to observe the modifications which the experience of these countries

has suggested. So early as 1794, the American House of Representatives had discovered the inconveniences arising out of debates upon questions of adjournment; and the prohibition of them*, which was then found necessary, has ever since been acquiesced in. In like manner, the House of Representatives, having found by experience that the power of a small minority to insist upon a division is objectionable, will not permit any division to take place, unless one-fifth of the members present concur in requiring it.† The experience of the French Chamber of Deputies had led them to a similar conclusion; and a *scrutin secret* could only be insisted upon (except in certain cases) by the requisition of twenty members.‡ It will be for the House of Commons to consider how far restrictions, of a similar character, are necessary or desirable.

These foreign assemblies were also obliged to resort to measures for preventing the undue protraction of their debates; and, assuredly, not without sufficient cause. The debates in the American Congress have sometimes been of almost fabulous duration. One is recorded which continued without intermission from Saturday morning till Monday morning§; and, with less extraordinary sittings, many other debates, from day to day, have lasted for periods unknown in our own Parliamentary annals. In the French Chamber of Deputies, debates occasionally lasted for a fortnight, and even for twenty days.¶ It is not surprising, therefore, that in both countries a remedy should have been provided for an evil, at once so great and so ridiculous. In America, by means of 'the previous question,' and in France by '*la clôture*,' the majority were empowered to determine, by a vote, that a debate should, at once, be brought to a conclusion. This coercion of the minority into silence, has been quietly submitted to in America from 1789 to the present time; and in France it was borne, with equal patience, from 1814 until Louis Napoleon imposed silence upon majorities as well as minorities, by a *coup d'état*.

In 1848, serious apprehensions were entertained that the debates of the House of Commons would become as obnoxious as those of our French and American contemporaries; and the adoption of similar modes of repression, under improved forms, was under consideration; but latterly there has been less cause

* Rules of the House of Representatives, No. 48.

† Ibid. No. 4.

‡ Réglemens 34, 35.

§ Report on Public Business, 1848. Evidence of Mr. Curtis, Questions 252, 253.

¶ Ibid. Evidence of M. Guizot, Questions 312, 313.

for alarm. The debates on Mr. Disraeli's House-duty, and on the second reading of the India Bill, which were the longest of the Session, each occupied four nights only; nor can we call to mind any recent occasion on which such a power as that of *la clôture* could reasonably have been exercised. The wholesome corrective of public opinion has restrained our representatives from such excesses as would have rendered more imperative restrictions unavoidable; and unless there should hereafter be an urgent necessity for interference, it is not probable that the House will consent to this limitation of its debates. In case, however, the question of *la clôture* should come under consideration, we are able to offer—what will be much more persuasive with the House of Commons than any argument—a *precedent*. On the 9th of May, 1604, 'upon Sir Rowland Litton's offer 'to speak in this matter, resolved no more should speak.'*

The Americans finding that even the 'previous question,' and some other rules of the same description, were an insufficient protection against the length of their debates, established, in 1841, 'the one hour rule,' by which every member was restricted to a speech of one hour. No exception is permitted, even in favour of the proposer of any question; and it is said that the rule has not only been successful in shortening the debates, but that it has improved their character. The sessions have been shorter, the legislation equally good, and the speeches decidedly better, and more to the purpose. The 'one-hour rule' is not without its advocates in this country; the veteran debater, Mr. Hume, being of the number, who, though himself the most frequent of speakers, would rarely suffer from the restriction he proposes for others. But unless long speeches should come more into fashion, there does not appear to be any sufficient reason for interfering with the discretion of individual members, in one of their most important functions. Frivolous and obstructive debates, raised upon formal questions, ought not to be endured, in spite of the political strategy occasionally connected with them; but *bonâ fide* debates, upon questions fairly submitted to the deliberations of the House, are deserving of indulgence, even when their length becomes inconvenient. In America the 'one-hour rule' had been tried on particular occasions for twenty years before it was generally adopted; and if the experiment were deemed worthy of a trial, an occasional enforcement of the rule would be the best method of testing its efficacy. There are many bills on which the speeches might be limited to a quarter of an hour in committee; and the Wed-

nesday morning sittings would also afford a good opportunity of initiating the experiment.

We believe that the House would be willing to acquiesce in any reasonable restrictions upon its debates. Nothing that has here been suggested approaches, in severity, the prohibition imposed some years since upon debates on presenting petitions. The presentation of a petition had long been a popular mode of raising a debate upon the subject to which it referred; but at length the evil of such irregular discussions, interfering with the appointed business of the House, and leading to no practical results, became intolerable; and members very generally acquiesced in their absolute prohibition. Yet, as regards petitions, it was plausibly contended that not only were the rights of members infringed, but also the rights of the people, as petitioners. Necessity, in this case, justified a departure from an ancient and popular custom; and the same overruling plea will more readily be admitted, in restraining mere abuses which have never enjoyed any popular sanction.

Among the expedients which have been suggested for bringing the Session of Parliament to a close, at an earlier period of the year, are a November meeting, and an alteration of the financial year. Prior to the Union with Ireland, in 1801, the ordinary time for the meeting of Parliament (though not without numerous exceptions) was in the month of November. From about 1805 until 1820 it became the more general practice for Parliament to be assembled after Christmas; but the Session usually commenced between the 14th of January and the end of the month. Since 1820 the more ordinary time of meeting has been in the first week of February. The time for assembling Parliament has thus been getting later, and meetings before Christmas less frequent, while the amount of business to be transacted has been continually on the increase.

If it were thought advisable to revert to the practice of November meetings, it would be attended with much less inconvenience than in the last century. To travel from Belfast or Inverness in winter, is scarcely more tedious now, than the journey from Bath or Cheltenham sixty years ago. But a meeting of Parliament before Christmas involves almost a double Session; and recent experience of its effects is very discouraging, as the latest as well as the longest Sessions have been those which commenced in November. The period before Christmas is too limited for any effectual progress in important measures; and unless some portion of the necessary business of the Session can be cleared off, the result obtained is not worth the undeniable inconvenience of an early meeting. The better

course would seem to be a meeting not later than the 15th of January, which would enable Parliament to dispose of all the preliminaries of a Session, and to enter upon the consideration of some of the principal Government measures, before the time at which it is usually assembled. If these measures have been carefully prepared, and be pressed forward with little interruption, a considerable part of the effective work of the Session might be accomplished before Easter.

Until 1832 the financial year had been dated from the 1st of January, but in that year the Government first submitted estimates for one quarter to the 31st of March, and subsequently the annual estimates from the 1st of April 1832 to the 31st of March 1833. The grounds upon which this alteration was made were explained by Lord Althorp on the 13th of February; and the debate on that occasion may throw some light upon the proposition, which has lately been made by Mr. Drummond, for reverting to the arrangements which it was then thought fit to change. Lord Althorp said, —

‘By the course hitherto taken, the estimates had been proposed after a certain amount of the money had actually been expended; and of course that expenditure must have been made without the previous sanction of Parliament. It seemed to him an anomalous mode of proceeding that they should vote the supplies for the service of the year on estimates, although at the time the estimates were submitted to them, a part of the expenditure had actually been made. With the view of avoiding that anomaly, he thought it more consistent with the privileges of that House, and with the theory of the Constitution, that the estimates should be submitted for the ensuing year previously to the supplies being voted, and before the Government had spent any of the money.’

Sir Robert Peel observed, that, ‘if the plan now proposed could be effected without inconvenience, it would undoubtedly remove a great anomaly;’ but he remarked upon the practical difficulties that would be experienced in voting all the supplies before the 1st of April. These difficulties were fully admitted by Sir James Graham, on the part of the Government; but the change when effected would, he was sure, be found invaluable, and if the House chose to enforce it, would secure that real control of the House over the expenditure, which he desired to see established.’

This new financial year, approved by the Government, and adopted with the general concurrence of all parties, it is now again proposed to alter. The objects supposed to be attainable by reverting to the 1st of January, are an earlier Budget and measures consequent upon it, as well as earlier votes in

the Committee of Supply, the postponement of which, under present arrangements, unquestionably tends to the prolongation of a Session. The maintenance of our land and sea forces being dependent upon annual votes, early measures for that purpose are indispensable: and thus far the constitutional object of the change of 1832 has been reasonably well carried out. Although the army and navy estimates have not usually been voted, in detail, before the 31st of March, the most important votes, necessarily involving the aggregate estimate of expenditure, have always been taken, before the Government expended any money on the army and navy, for the ensuing year. The same principle might readily be followed out in regard to the civil services. The salaries and other expenses, payable out of the grants of the preceding year, are discharged on the 31st of March; and the first payment out of votes of the current year, is not due until the 30th of June. Here then are three months for the consideration of the civil service estimates—a time amply sufficient for ensuring the maintenance of the principle that no money shall be expended by the Government, until it has been voted by Parliament. Then why is it not done? Simply because, according to the present rules of the House, it is more difficult even to approach the Committee of Supply, than to bring any other business to a conclusion. If irrelevant motions on going into committee were prohibited, all the army and navy estimates, without any exception, could be voted before the 31st of March, and the civil service estimates before the 30th of June. And thus two important results would be secured by one simple regulation, the advantage of which, on other grounds, has been already noticed. The constitutional principle would be maintained, and the financial measures so far advanced, as to ensure an earlier termination of the Session. That such results should be attainable by so small a change of practice, is an illustration of the political importance of mere forms, and of the necessity of regarding them with the eye of a statesman.

A more important question than any which has hitherto been considered is, whether essential changes might not be made, with advantage, in the interior organisation of Parliament. The two Houses comprise upwards of 1100 members. Genius, learning, rank, ambition, industry, common sense, and practical experience, are all largely represented there. But are these numbers, and these various talents, so employed as to produce adequate results? Is there a sufficient division of employments, in the work of legislation? Do many labour where the well-directed energies of a smaller number would be more effectual?

Is the same work done again and again; and is it, at last, done well? These are questions worthy of grave consideration.

The political uses of numbers in the constitution of a legislature are, the representation of every opinion, interest, and party, and the weight which is consequently attached to its determinations. A small legislative body would be overborne by clamour and cabals, like a council of ministers: but a numerous body is strong enough to resist every influence but the popular will; and even that it is often able to withstand for a time. Abstractedly a thousand men will not arrive at juster conclusions than ten; and the ultimate judgment of the thousand is directed by a very small proportion of these numbers; yet, in a free state, the leading men would be powerless, unless supported by a numerous following of rank and file. It is power, rather than wisdom, that is the characteristic of numbers. The conclusions deducible from these considerations are these,—that it is the proper function of the whole body to discuss and determine the principles, and direct the general policy of legislation; while under its directions, and subject to its approval, a smaller body, with delegated powers, should be charged with the office of elaborating the details. This principle, though recognised in many of the proceedings of Parliament, is very imperfectly carried out. For many purposes the agency of committees is constantly resorted to; but rarely for the relief of the whole body, in the performance of legislative functions. Every Public Bill is considered on at least four distinct occasions in each House, and its several provisions are also discussed by what is nominally a Committee of the whole House, but which is, in fact, the House itself without its Speaker. Even when a Bill has been referred to a Select Committee, it is afterwards submitted to a Committee of the whole House. In the passing of laws the House does everything, and its Committees nothing: and this, we think, is a defective organisation of the means at its disposal.

A Committee of the whole House affords no relief whatever to the House itself: it occupies the attention of all its members, and no other business can proceed during its sitting. A Select Committee consists of a small number of members, generally not exceeding fifteen; and though well calculated for purposes of inquiry, does not sufficiently represent the opinions of the House, in deliberating upon any question of public policy. The determination of so small a body, arrived at without any public discussion, has comparatively little influence in restraining subsequent debates, upon the same questions, in the House itself. No other committee of an intermediate character, com-

bining the numbers and representative constitution of the Committee of the whole House, with the independent action of a Select Committee, is, at the present time, acknowledged amongst the institutions of Parliament. The Grand Committees of ancient times for religion, for grievances, for courts of justice, and for trade, were kept alive, for form's sake, for many years after they had ceased to be anything more than a name: but even their formal appointment has been discontinued since 1832. And the Committee of Privileges, which was of a similar constitution, still exists, indeed, but in a state of suspended animation. To revive committees which by common consent have been abandoned, would be a futile experiment; but the principle upon which they were originally established, may be applied to a new organisation of committees. Committees of the whole House may be retained for the consideration of all matters involving taxation, and other important questions specially referred to them: but Grand Committees should also be constituted, for settling the clauses of public bills, and for initiating various proceedings which now originate in committees of the whole House.

The organisation of such a plan might be attempted in the following manner. The House should be divided into six Grand Committees, consisting of about 110 members each, to whom would be added 15 or 20 ministers and other leading members, who would be nominated to serve upon all the Grand Committees. The members would be distributed by a Committee of Selection, subject to approval by the House, in such a manner as to secure an equal representation of political parties, interests, and classes in all the committees; and, at the same time, to maintain in each, a preponderance of members more particularly conversant with its peculiar department of business. Thus the Grand Committee for Trade would comprise a large proportion of merchants and of the representatives of commercial constituencies; and the Committee for Courts of Justice an ample complement of 'gentlemen of the long robe.' The constitution and functions of these several committees would be different; but all would be political representatives of the larger body, from which they are drawn, and little Parliaments, as it were, in themselves. The province of one would probably be Religion and Ecclesiastical Affairs; of another, Law and Courts of Justice; of a third, Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures; of a fourth, Local Taxation and Administration; of a fifth, Colonial and Indian Possessions; and, of a sixth, Education and General Purposes.

The first function of these committees would be to consider

the provisions of every Public Bill referred to them; and, for that purpose, their proceedings should be assimilated to those of a Committee of the whole House. Each committee should have assigned to it a chamber, arranged so as to admit of the distribution of parties, and to afford facilities for debate. It would be a novel experiment to admit the public and reporters to the deliberations of a committee; but this would be an essential part of the proposed plan. The main object in view is to invest the deliberations of these committees with as much importance as possible, and to delegate to them the discussion, and, as far as possible, the decision, of questions which now devolve wholly on the House. If this could be accomplished, the labours of the House would be, to that extent, diminished. Perhaps the number of days in the week on which the House would sit might be diminished: at all events the length of the sittings might be curtailed, and the two or three hours after midnight, which now inflict so much fatigue and inconvenience upon busy members, might be often spared. The tendency of such an arrangement would be to make the House a Court of Appeal, as it were, from its Grand Committees, rather than a Court of Primary Jurisdiction, in all legislative matters, as it is at present. It would determine the questions fit to be referred to its Committees, and would revise their decisions if necessary, instead of undertaking to settle the details, as well as resolving the principles, of all legislation.

Other incidental advantages may be anticipated from the reference of bills to Grand Committees. At present the discussion of the clauses of a bill is regarded, by the majority of members, as a wearisome interruption to the more proper business of the House. Few members take part in it; and those who attend are impatient to proceed to other matters, in which they are more interested. The bills are, therefore, hastily amended, while members who would be competent to assist in their revision, meet with little encouragement in offering suggestions to an impatient audience. In a Grand Committee, whose deliberations offered no impediment to the progress of business in the House, and whose proper duty it was to discuss the clauses of a bill, a more careful revision of them might reasonably be expected. The majority of the members would, probably, be interested in the subject of discussion; and those who desired to offer their opinions, would be heard without impatience. A grand committee, indeed, would be an admirable school for members, in which many excellent men of business, who are rarely heard in the House itself, would be able to render efficient service, and to gain distinction for themselves, by their knowledge and prac-

tical judgment. In each Grand Committee the Government would be represented by its official members who had charge of any bill, and by independent members co-operating with them; and the Opposition and other parties would have equal opportunities of advancing their own opinions. If their debates were published, the public would also be fully informed of their proceedings, and prepared to influence the ultimate decision of the House, when their reports should come under consideration.

The *quorum* of these committees need not exceed twenty, or at the utmost twenty-five; which would be sufficient for the transaction of ordinary business, while questions of importance would attract a full attendance of members. Their sittings might be conveniently held in the largest of the New Committee Rooms, which could be fitted up for their accommodation and, if necessary, enlarged by an encroachment upon adjoining rooms, many of which are of unnecessary dimensions. They would sit on certain days of the week, in the morning, and, like other committees, adjourn on the assembling of the House.

It can scarcely be objected that a Grand Committee would be too limited to represent, with fairness, the general sentiments of the House, so long as 40 members out of 654 are held to be sufficient for all purposes of legislation. Nay, by the present rules of the House, even 20 members, though opposed by 19, may bind the whole House to an irrevocable vote. Nor, in less exceptional cases, does the final judgment of the House depend upon the aggregate numbers in a division. For example, in the last Session, Lord Robert Grosvenor's Attorneys' Certificate Duty Bill had been brought in by a considerable majority in a House consisting of 391 members: it was rejected, on the second reading, in a house of 293 members only. And again, the fate of the Advertisement Duty affords a still more striking instance of the reversal of decisions, by smaller numbers than those by which they were originally agreed to. On the 14th April, after one of the very best speeches of the Session, Mr. Milner Gibson carried a resolution for the repeal of the Advertisement Duty in a full House of 374 members (the respective numbers being 202 and 171). The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, at a subsequent period, instead of adopting this vote as the expression of the will of the House, proposed a reduction of the duty from eighteen pence to sixpence. This compromise was not accepted by Mr. Milner Gibson and his friends; and on the 1st July the battle was renewed. The Government at first succeeded in carrying their proposition by a majority of 10 only, in a House of 213 (the numbers being 111 and 101); and reversed, for a time, the previous decision of

374 members. Their triumph was brief. It was the night of a state ball at Buckingham Palace. The supporters of the Government hastened from the division lobby to the ball-room; while their sturdier opponents, resolute of purpose and not much given to dancing—even if invited to dance—continued the fight in a thin House of 136 members. It was now too late to rescind the previous vote directly; but being well skilled in fence, they succeeded in affirming, by a majority of 9 (the numbers being 72 and 63), that the future advertisement duty should be 0*l.* 0*s.* 0*d.*! After much consideration, the Government resolved not to disturb this determination; and we are indebted to 72 members and a Queen's ball, for our present complete exemption from a tax, which nearly one-third of the House had previously failed in repealing. The luckless attorneys were the only class who suffered in this contest; for Mr. Gladstone, in surrendering the sixpence on advertisements, begged hard for the Certificate Duty, as an equivalent; and for this sixpence the opponents of 'taxes on knowledge' consented to the sacrifice of their legal friends.

On numerous occasions, in every Session, the members present at a division are considerably less than one hundred; and a division with so many as three hundred is comparatively rare. To refer again to the last Session for examples: out of 257 divisions, there were 20 of less than 100 members; 142 of more than 100, and less than 200; 53 of more than 200, and less than 300; and 39 only exceeding 300. The average number present in all the divisions was 201.

In the presence of these statistics, it will hardly be contended that Grand Committees will afford an inadequate representation of the whole body of members. In the House, nothing can be more irregular and capricious than the attendance of members even when great questions are to be decided without further appeal: and it is notorious that the House is occasionally liable to clandestine surprises and ambushades. The Grand Committees might possibly be exposed to similar irregularities; but every vote would be open to revision by the House; and their minutes of proceedings and division lists would show how far they had paid attention to their duties, and were entitled to support.

If the experiment of Grand Committees should prove successful in the case of Bills, it might be extended to other descriptions of business with equal, if not greater advantage. Bills relating to religion or trade, for instance, which are now required to originate in a Committee of the whole House, as well as other Bills, might more conveniently be initiated in

these committees; by which means the House would be relieved of many preliminary discussions. With what alacrity would the House refer the questions of Maynooth and the Nunneries to the Grand Committee of Religion! how gladly consign intricate questions of Law Reform to the Grand Committee on Law and Courts of Justice! And while much pressure might thus be transferred from the House, many members would have an opportunity of submitting their motions to Grand Committees who now wait hopelessly for a hearing, in the House itself.

Care would naturally be taken to prevent committees from withholding any matters from the consideration of the House. They would merely decide upon questions specifically referred to them, and their votes would be subject to reversal. Nor would ministerial responsibility be diminished by this system. If the committees were taken indiscriminately from the body of the House, the Government for the time being would ordinarily have a majority in each committee; and if occasionally outvoted there, would assemble their forces in the House, and refuse to adopt the report of the committee.

The examples of France and America are of little avail in estimating the importance of this experiment. The French Chamber of Deputies was divided into nine *bureaux* of fifty-one members each. The distribution of the members into *bureaux* was not arranged upon any principle of selection, but was determined by lot. Every month the names of all the members were put into a box, and drawn out by the President; and each list of fifty-one names, drawn in succession, constituted the nine *bureaux*.* Brought together by chance, shuffled and dealt out like a pack of cards, and again separated at the end of a month, the members of a *bureau* could scarcely be expected to evince any unity of purpose or effective organisation for business. Nor were such qualifications essential to the object they were intended to serve. A *projet de loi*, or other proposition, was referred to all the *bureaux* at once, and discussed by all. The minister, to whose department any measure related, explained its objects and policy to the *bureau* of which he chanced to be a member; and a conversation, rather than a debate, ensued amongst its members, sitting round the table. No reporters were present, and the discussions were ordinarily unknown to the public; but occasionally, when it served the

* After the Revolution of 1848, the National Assembly, being a more numerous body than the Chamber of Deputies, was divided into fifteen *bureaux*.

purpose of a popular minister or member of the Opposition—like M. Thiers—to give early publicity to his opinions, a speech, delivered privately in the *bureau*, would find its way to the newspapers. When the discussion was concluded, the *bureau* proceeded—not to vote for or against the proposition—not to agree to any report to the Chamber—but simply to nominate one of its members to serve upon a commission. Of course this member represented the opinions of the majority of the *bureau*; and consequently the nine members, of whom the commission was composed, became a fair representation of the entire Chamber. The object of the *bureau*, therefore, was to bring to a focus, as it were, the various opinions and suggestions elicited by nine independent discussions, in which every member of the Chamber had an opportunity of taking part. The Commission again discussed the *projet de loi*, and appointed one of their members to be ‘the reporter,’ by whom an elaborate report was prepared, for presentation to the Chamber, explanatory of the views of the Commission.

Notwithstanding the complication of this machinery, the system of *bureaux* has found so much favour in France, that, whether under King or President, it has continued to be a national institution; but, after all, it would seem to arrive, by a troublesome process, at results attainable by the simpler method of debating questions in the House, and deciding them, at once, by a majority.

In the American House of Representatives there are twenty-eight standing committees; twenty-two of which consist of nine, and six of five members each. With these committees originate nearly all the bills which are introduced to the notice of Congress. A member may move for leave to bring in a bill; but if his motion be agreed to, it is immediately referred to one of the standing committees, or to a select committee specially appointed for the purpose. Thus, bills never come under discussion in the House, until after they have been prepared or examined by a committee, when they may be presumed to be in a fit state for consideration; and, in this respect, the American system resembles that of the proposed Grand Committees. But the standing committees of the United States have other functions; as, for example, the examination of the revenue and expenditure of the current year, and military and foreign affairs, which in this country would be inconsistent with executive responsibility. Nothing of this description would be referred to the Grand Committees; but the example of America is useful as showing the extent to which the agency of committees has been made available, in the work of legislation.

We now approach a question of acknowledged importance, connected with practical legislation. Complaints have so frequently been made in Parliament, from the bench, the bar, and the press, of the hasty and ill-considered provisions of the public statutes,—of their loose and illogical arrangement, their obscure and often inaccurate phrasology, and their legal blunders, that our readers may claim to be spared any illustration of them. The modern statutes are not quite so bad as they are popularly supposed to be; but they are susceptible of very great and systematic improvements. Next to an epic poem, we believe an Act of Parliament to be the most difficult of all compositions. One mind, indeed, is rarely equal to the preparation even of a perfect *draft*, still less of a final legislative measure. Ready learning, patient study, practical knowledge, an appreciation of all conceivable circumstances amounting to imagination, logical discrimination, and the most critical nicety of language, are all essential to the due performance of the task. An Act of Parliament is not criticised like other works of art. Learned critics vie with one another to discover some hidden meaning in a chorus of *Æschylus*, which to common understandings has none at all; while the most subtle minds are striving to make unintelligible the language of statutes which, in any other composition, would be plain enough. No human skill will always be proof against such an ordeal; but by the present system of passing bills, a statute is exposed to so many dangers before it attains maturity, that we have often wondered, not that it should contain some obvious blunders, but by what happy chance it has escaped the enactment of sheer nonsense, in very bad grammar. However carefully it may have been originally prepared, no sooner is it out of the hands of the draftsman than its ‘unities’ are set at nought. A word omitted here, a clause added there, terms already used in one sense, inserted elsewhere, in another,—make such havoc in it, that its author would scarcely recognise his own work. Nor is he present to advise and assist in the amendment of his draft. It has been given over to the care of a minister or member, who, though well informed as to the general policy of the measure, has borne no part in the unthankful labour of its composition. To conciliate one member and make another hold his tongue, he would break the heart of the patient law-maker, who has pondered over every word before he wrote it down. The sudden thought of a conversational debater has more weight than the well-advised judgment of the learned draftsman. And should he be again consulted, it may be too late wholly to correct the errors of others. Amendments have been agreed to which can-

not be withdrawn with good faith, or have been voted by the House, whose decision may not be lightly set aside; and so the legislative patchwork is permitted to take its chance, with other performances of the same description.

The evil of thus disconnecting the lawmaker from the legislature is one that obviously needs a remedy. Bentham, impressed with the inconveniences of the present system of passing laws, went so far as to propose that a statute, having been prepared by official lawmakers, should be adopted by Parliament without amendment, or else rejected altogether. A proposal which gives Parliament only a veto upon the work of the draftsman cannot be seriously entertained; and even as an expedient for ensuring improvements in the mechanical part of legislation, it has little to recommend it. The lawmakers and the legislature would still be unconnected; and laws drawn up in the study, without the aid of public discussion, would rarely be fit for adoption without amendment.

Lord Brougham, the first of modern law-reformers, has repeatedly called attention to the defects of our legislative processes. He, too, attaches great importance to the functions of the lawmaker, and deprecates the inconsiderate amendments too often made in his work, by the legislature. In speaking of the treatment of his own Digest of the Bankruptcy Laws, by a Committee of the House of Commons, he says —

‘No Committee can undertake with advantage the minute consideration of the terms in which provisions agreed upon as to their substance shall be couched. Confidence must of necessity be placed in the learning, skill, and diligence of those who have prepared the Digest.’*

For the remedy of the evils of which he has so often complained, his Lordship proposes the establishment of a board or court of learned and practised men — irremovable from office except upon the address of both Houses of Parliament — to revise the drafts of all bills before they are introduced, and again after they have been amended. Such a board, resembling in its character and functions the *Conseil d’Etat* of the French, has much to recommend it; but its constitution and its relations to Parliament would require grave consideration.

Parliament has already within itself the means of ensuring improved legislation with very little aid from without. Assuming that Grand Committees are to be appointed for the general

* Letter to Sir James Graham on the Making and Digesting of the Law, 1849, p. 5.

consideration of bills, a Sub-Committee, selected from each Grand Committee, might be charged with their technical revision. The Sub-Committee, composed of a few of the most practical members, and including some lawyers, should be attended by the draftsman, officer, or commissioners, who prepared the bill, and by the minister or member having charge of it. No bill should be reported by the Grand Committee until it had undergone this revision: and if amendments were subsequently made by the House, the bill might, if necessary, be again referred to the committee. This plan would bring into useful communication the lawmaker and the legislature, and would unite the practised skill of the one, with the political enlightenment and authority of the other. At present no responsibility is publicly attached to the draftsman. He works behind the scenes, like a newspaper writer, without personal credit or blame. The Government or member, by whom his work is adopted, enjoys the credit of success and the disgrace of failure. He would now become responsible for his own defaults. His pen which drew the bill, would also draw the amendments, under the directions and subject to the approval of the committee. Many heads would co-operate in the revision; but one hand only would hold the pen. Unity of design and expression would, at least, be secured by these means, and a competent lawmaker would generally be able to resist the introduction of unsuitable amendments. This simple plan, involving no charge upon the public, and little alteration in the existing practice of Parliament, would be productive of the best results. If, however, some official organisation were required, for assisting in the revision of bills and for maintaining uniformity in the work of various hands and different committees, this object might be secured in connexion with another important change of parliamentary procedure, which we are about to propose.

Many of the proposals we have hitherto made, though calculated to relieve the House and improve its legislation, involve, at the same time, a considerable enlargement of the duties of committees. And it may be asked, Are there not already too many committees?—and have they not more than enough to do? Has it not been said that thirty-three committees have been sitting on a single day? Then why add to the number? Nothing can be further from our intention. There *are* already too many committees—they *have* too much to do—of necessity they do a great part of their business very ill—and we propose to relieve them of the most onerous and the least satisfactory of their duties.

The large number of committees on private bills has been

noticed in our summary of the business of last Session. They form, indeed, a serious proportion of the engagements of members for about three months of every Session, and sometimes more. In 1846, there were no less than 123 committees on opposed private bills alone, the aggregate sittings of which amounted to the extraordinary number of 1048 days. The work would have occupied one committee nearly four years, sitting from day to day! In 1847, there were 88 committees; and their sittings extended to 720 days. During the seven years from 1846 to 1852, there have been 377 of these committees: and the annual average has amounted to 53, sitting for eight days each; and this in addition to very numerous committees on unopposed bills. On the whole, it may be estimated that between 350 and 400 members are occupied, about 10 days each, by services in connexion with private bills. (Of their duties in a railway committee we need say but little:—they are too well known as difficult, laborious, responsible, and irksome, to need any illustration. But are they properly performed?—and could they be performed better by a different tribunal? In selecting the members to serve upon any committee, the principal qualification of the greater number has been that they had no pecuniary or local interest in the questions about to be considered by them; or, in other words, that they happened not to be shareholders in any of the companies concerned, or landholders in the contested district. Their impartiality being thus assumed, they are appointed to try some of the most important and difficult issues that can possibly come before any tribunal in the country. No judicial training or experience—no special aptitude for business, or familiarity with the matters on which they are about to adjudicate, are expected of any member of the committee, except perhaps the chairman. These are undoubted facts, which none will be found to deny; but on the results of the system there is still little unanimity of opinion. By many it is said ‘to work well’—a dubious phrase,—to secure, at least, a greater number of just than of unjust decisions, and to give fairer play to enterprise and the rivalry of capitalists than could be anticipated from the exertions of any permanent tribunal. From others we hear nothing but ridicule and contempt. There is a favourite story amongst practitioners, of a young member, who had been sitting, for three weeks, in judgment upon the engineering merits of two rival lines of railway, suddenly arousing himself to ask, ‘Pray what is a ‘gradient?’ And we have been assured by an eminent railway engineer that the following conflict of decisions, upon the leading principles of railway legislation, actually occurred in a single

week. The question to be tried by four different committees, sitting at the same time, and in adjoining rooms, was this: Which of two rival lines is to be preferred,—the shortest and most direct, or the more circuitous, which accommodates a larger population, more towns, and a greater traffic? The first committee preferred the shortest line; the second, the more circuitous; the third would sanction neither of the lines; and the fourth decided in favour of *both*. And this anecdote, however exaggerated it may be, serves to illustrate one of the chief evils of the existing system. The committees may be individually just; but how is it possible for them to carry out any uniform principle of legislation?

Another great evil is, that every bill has to pass the ordeal of two select committees—one in the Commons, the other in the Lords. There is no security that the principles of decision adopted by both committees will be identical, and much probability that they will be different. When an opposed bill has passed the Commons, the opposition may be renewed in the Lords. After the expense of an opposition has been incurred before the Commons' committee, and the committee have reported in its favour, the Lords' committee may find that the preamble has not been proved; and thus all the expenses of a successful contest before the Commons' committee are thrown away.

The great Railway Companies, whose parliamentary triumphs have generally conciliated their support of the system under which they have risen to greatness, are now beginning to calculate their past losses and estimate their future dangers. 'A most competent witness,' says the Committee of last Session on Railways, 'has estimated the loss of money to the railway shareholders, unnecessarily incurred in obtaining parliamentary authority for, and in constructing the railways now in existence, and in opposing rival schemes, at *seventy millions!*' Another witness informed the Committee that two thousand miles of railway, involving an outlay of more than forty millions, have been sanctioned by Parliament, and afterwards abandoned by the promoters, without any parliamentary authority. If to these be added the numerous lines which have been relinquished under the sanction of Parliament, it would seem as if the mileage abandoned were about half as much as the mileage constructed, which amounted in June last to 7,512 miles in the United Kingdom. In other words, for every two miles of railway authorised, and sufficiently well selected to be ultimately made, one mile of railway was either so bad in itself, or so ill-supported by its promoters, as to be abandoned with loss

to the greater part of the persons concerned. We will say nothing of the number of lines which have indeed been made, but much to the regret of shareholders, who heartily wish they had been abandoned. Their history is briefly told by the Share List.

These are great national evils, but the blame of them is to be borne by railway speculators rather than by Parliament. If two litigious parties insist upon ruining themselves in a Court of Justice, by endless suits, instead of adjusting their differences by arbitration or compromise, we blame not the Court but the suitors. But possibly they may be saved from themselves, and the various interests involved, render the experiment a national object. The railway property in Great Britain alone amounted in 1851 to 248,240,897*l.*, and the gross revenue upon this capital to 15,000,000*l.* We are persuaded that the aggregate capital invested in railways and other public undertakings sanctioned by Parliament, will soon be equal in amount to the National Debt, and this enormous property ought not to be endangered by the accidents and mischances to which it has hitherto been exposed.

With this view Mr. Cardwell, after investigating the difficult question of railway legislation with great care and judgment, proposed an improved constitution of railway committees, which is to be tried in the ensuing Session. His plan is to secure the services of a small number of well-qualified members, who are expected to devote a considerable part of the Session to their laborious duties, and by frequent communication to maintain uniformity of decision. This was probably the best expedient that could then have been proposed, with any reasonable prospect of immediate success. If more could have been done, Mr. Cardwell was not likely to shrink from the attempt; but the failure of previous experiments, the jealous regard of Parliament for its own jurisdiction, and the apprehensions of the railway interest lest any considerable change should diminish their influence or affect their property, forbade the proposal of a bolder scheme. We regard it, however, as the first insertion of the wedge, which repeated blows will drive deeper and deeper, until the entire system is rent asunder. It is 'the beginning of 'the end.' The new experiment is to be applied to railway bills alone; all other private bills, scarcely inferior in importance, being left, for the present, in their accustomed course. The system which has been condemned cannot be long continued: and of the new scheme we entertain no very sanguine anticipations. Its pressure upon unpaid members of Parliament will be intolerable; and we doubt if they will prove otherwise

equal to the heavy responsibilities imposed upon them. The new committee of forty will, sooner or later, be superseded by a more efficient tribunal, just as the Committee on Petitions for Private Bills, on the model of which it is founded, has long since given way to judicial officers of the House. Government Boards have been tried and found wanting; and we hope to see the establishment of a Judicial Court within the walls of Parliament, performing the same functions as committees on private bills. This Court should be common to both Houses, to whom it should make its reports, and thus the double inquiry, in Lords and Commons, now so vexatious and costly to the parties, would be avoided. Lord Brougham proposed a plan, founded upon this principle, in 1836; and the twenty-four resolutions submitted by him to the House of Lords embody, in forcible language, the reasons for the proposed change. The trial of this, or some analogous plan, may still be postponed for a few years, but we regard its ultimate adoption as inevitable.

We have now adverted to the principal inconveniences experienced in the practical working of our Parliamentary Government, and have endeavoured to indicate the nature of the remedies which appear to be wanting. The objects we have in view are not many, nor difficult of attainment. To limit the occasions for debate, without restricting its freedom; to discourage irregularities, in order to increase the opportunities for grave discussion; to organise the vast resources of Parliament, so as to diminish the labour and increase the efficiency of its deliberations;—these are the ends to be accomplished. The means proposed are simple and free from hazard, founded upon existing practice, borne out by experience, and not trenching upon any constitutional principle. Without giving undue facilities to a Government, or embarrassing the legitimate tactics of an Opposition, they would conduce to the dignity of Parliament, the credit, utility, and comfort of its members, and the public good.

ART. VIII. — 1. *Lettres sur la Turquie, ou Tableau statistique, religieux, politique, administratif, militaire, commercial de l'Empire Ottoman depuis le Khatti-Cherif de Gulhani.* Par M. A. UBICINI. Paris: 1853.

2. *Zustand der Türkei im Jahre der Prophezeiung, 1853.* Von HUBERT VON BOEHN, Königlich Preussischem Second-Lieutenant. Berlin: 1853.

3. *The Ottoman Empire and its Resources, with Statistical Tables, &c.* By EDWARD H. MICHELSEN, Phil. D. London : 1853.
4. *Three Years in Constantinople ; or, Domestic Manners of the Turks in 1844.* By CHARLES WHITE, Esq. London: 1845.

WE have selected these works from the enormous mass of literary compilations to which the present state of Eastern Europe has given birth, in order to combine in the remarks we are about to make on the same subject the testimony of competent writers from each of the three nations which have interposed their influence and their aid to arrest the doom of Turkey and to resist the aggressions of Russia. It would have been easy to call witnesses more adverse to Turkish institutions ; but we purposely avoid resting the opinion we have formed on the highly coloured statements of Mr. Macfarlane or the animated sketches drawn by Mr. St. John. The writers we have chosen are all rather friendly than hostile to Turkey : two of them have laboured in their several vocations to promote the reformation of the Empire. They are, therefore, qualified to inform us of the results which have attended their efforts, and their evidence may be received without a suspicion that it is biassed by any predilection for Russian interests. Before any correct opinion can be formed on the political bearing of this question, it is desirable to obtain as far as possible a clear and dispassionate view of the facts on which the duration of the Turkish Empire must depend. The events which have already kindled hostilities on the Danube and the Black Sea, and threaten to produce consequences so disastrous to the relations of the greater European Powers, are mainly to be judged of in reference to the social and political elements which have been thus rudely set in motion. The insolent and ill-judged embassy of Prince Menschikoff committed the Russian Government to a course of action from which it could not recede without discredit, and in which it could not advance without danger ; for it had staked its ascendancy in the East against its alliances in the West, and either alternative resulted in a loss on the one side or the other. Negotiations followed, into which every court of Europe entered with an earnest desire of peace, but without a full comprehension of the magnitude of the question, and without a spirit of union sufficiently compact and authoritative to drive the Czar at once beyond the Pruth. At last the Turkish Government thought itself arrived at a degree of preparation which gave it an advantage over the Russian forces

in the Principalities or on the Asiatic frontier, and, without further deference to the counsels and remonstrances of the Allied Powers, it gave the signal of war, and trusted to the force of events to involve the rest of Europe in its quarrel. Upon these facts, which are patent to the world, and which may be said to constitute the three first acts of this eventful passage in history, we have little to add which is not already familiar to every reader, or which will not be discussed to satiety when the conduct of the British Cabinet in these transactions comes under the notice of Parliament. But the questions which have thus been raised, and most unreasonably raised, by the Russian Government, involve much wider considerations; and, as this dispute has slipped through the fingers of the diplomatists, and touched the fiery matter of creeds, nationalities, and armies, the debates which it may call forth on certain points of political conduct are of far less moment to the world than the formation of opinions on the future condition of the territories and the nations now visibly agitated by one of the great convulsions of history and of war. Everything concurs to render Eastern Europe the scene of one of the most extraordinary contests of our age. It is still partly inhabited and wholly governed by a people which owed its greatness to martial energy and sanguinary absolutism, but which is ensnaked by the laws of a religion never yet professed by a truly civilised nation. Amidst all its pretensions to reform, every dispassionate observer of the state of the Turkish Empire brings back fresh evidence of its decay; and even those sanguine orientalist who speak of its progress cannot deny that the population of the Turkish race is rapidly declining — that the most fertile regions of the Old World are smitten with the curse of barrenness under their rule — that the cessation of the fierce and brutal control once exercised over the country by the Sultans has only secured greater impunity to corruption — and that the internal condition of the government and the empire is one of hopeless confusion. On the other hand, upon the northern frontier — from the river Pruth to the Colchian coast — lies that secular enemy of the Turk, whom the superstition of ages seems to have marked out as the inheritor of his dominions, and who affects to enlist in the cause of aggression the sympathies of the Christian Church and the institutions of a more civilised people; whilst Europe responds to these menacing demonstrations by a firm and united resolution, that whatever may be the fate of these regions they shall not become the undefended prey of Russia, and that, however difficult it may be to maintain a Turkish Empire, no Russian usurpation or conquest

shall transfer the empire of the East to the House of Romanoff. Between these contending parties lies the most interesting part of the subject,—the territory and the populations, who are at once the objects and the victims of the quarrel. In spite of the concessions of the Tanzimat to the Christian subjects of the Porte, and the more tolerant and enlightened maxims of the Sultan's present advisers, experience has taught the Christians how illusory are the hopes of civil equality, or even of real religious toleration, where authority is exclusively exercised by their bitterest enemies; and whilst the Slavonian provinces tend to assimilate themselves to the condition of Servia, the Greek race aspires, from the Gulf of Arta to the Gulf of Volo, to assert its independence.

It has been said by high authorities that the perils which attend the opening of such questions as these are so great that we are bound by the paramount interest of peace to ward off a discussion so fatal to the public tranquillity, and that the maintenance of the *status quo* of Turkey was to be purchased even at the sacrifice of the progress of civilisation and the interests of Christianity. But whatever may be the value of that argument, it is materially diminished by the fact that, be it for good or evil, this contest is no longer within the grasp of diplomatic correspondence, and that in all probability, far from seeing the termination of this momentous dispute, the ensuing spring will greatly extend its proportions. The British Government was, we think, fully justified in the means it took to avert as long as possible a question which threatened to expand to such formidable dimensions; and our first interest was that no such controversy should, at this time, be opened. Even for the Ottoman Empire, whatever be the actual results of the war, which no human being can clearly foresee or define, any diplomatic solution endorsed by the Four Powers of Europe would seem to us preferable to the efforts made and the risks incurred by such a contest. But these are now vain regrets. The course of events lies to action. The stagnant waters are stirred, and the occurrences now succeeding one another in rapid alternation leave at least this conviction on the mind — that Eastern Europe is about to undergo large and perhaps violent changes, and that the state of things which has subsisted in Turkey for the last fifteen years, under what must be termed the joint protection of the Great European Powers, is already at an end. Turkey has shown by her declaration of war, and by her subsequent operations, that she had spirit to resist the threat addressed to her, and strength to defy the forces meant to intimidate her. She has preferred the risks of independent

action to the condition of a protected State, whose existence was obviously weakened by the precautions with which it was surrounded ; and, to the astonishment of Europe, she has opened the campaign by more than one well-contested battle.

Yet we confess that even this momentary display of vigour, attended as it was at the outset by an amount of success scarcely contemplated by the warmest partisans of Turkey, does not materially alter the estimate we are led to form of the true condition of that Empire. We are still compelled to ask whether it be true that the Turk has materially altered his social institutions or his personal disposition, and whether the causes which have led to the progressive decay of the Ottoman Power have been eradicated, or whether they are of such a nature that none of the reforms attempted by Mahmoud and his son can effectually touch them. Upon a dispassionate review of the statements in the volumes before us, and in many others of the same character, rebutted only by the headlong assertions of a few French writers in the pay of the Turkish Government, we are struck by the large preponderance of evidence *against* the sincerity and success of this great experiment. A few of the Turkish pashas, who have acquired some of the tastes and opinions of Europe, and are supported in power by the influence of the European embassies, have recommended the wholesale importation of the instruments of European civilisation. Prussian officers have organised, not without success, the artillery of the Sultan, and improved, however imperfectly, the ordnance and fortifications of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. French officers have assisted in the formation of a sham Polytechnic school, and have converted the brilliant irregular cavalry of the East into most ineffective lancers and dragoons. English naval officers of high merit have laboured to introduce the order and efficiency of the British service into ships of the line manned by crews that have never been to sea. Every kind of industrial speculation in mines, agriculture, and manufactures has been started at one time or another by the whim of the Turkish Government, and abandoned after a large unprofitable outlay. Whenever a partial success has been attained, and some results achieved, it has not been by the real progress of the Turks in any branch of these arts, but either by the intelligence of Greeks or Armenians in their employ, or more often by the direct exertions of English or French settlers in Constantinople. Never was a state so instructed in the infancy of its civilisation, or so nursed in the decrepitude of its age ; and we owe the innumerable productions which load our table on this subject to the experience of a vast number of

persons engaged in these meritorious efforts. It is remarkable that not one of them in whose veracity and independence confidence can be placed ventures to boast of his success. On the contrary, there is scarcely one of these persons who have been brought to Stamboul by high salaries and the hope of a brilliant career, but tells the same tale of disappointment and wasted exertion; and although something has unquestionably been done to improve the material condition of Turkey, no such effect has been produced upon the Turks themselves. The magnificent situation of the capital, the inexhaustible resources of the provinces, and the intelligence and energy of the Christian population whenever they are properly directed, are such that Turkey requires little more than the permission of its rulers to become a flourishing country. But that permission will never be granted to it, as long as the form of political government remains what it now is; as long as the social institutions of the country are unchanged; as long, in a word, as the Koran is the fundamental law of the Empire.

It must suffice in this place to refer to a few of the more prominent of these abuses, which stamp the nation with incurable decay, because they are implanted in the very essence of Mussulman domination. There is no one fact which throws so much light on the social condition of a people as the tenure of land prevailing in any given country, and we regret that this subject has not been more fully elucidated by the writers and travellers who have described the state of the Ottoman Empire. If we are not much mistaken, the facts relating to this point alone would go far to explain the singular causes which have reduced the fairest regions of the Old World to barrenness, rendered the empire governing those magnificent territories a bankrupt State depending on the advances of usurers or the charity of strangers, and created a state of society, in which everything is sacrificed to a dominant class and an exclusive creed, though in that class, and amongst the professors of that creed, scarcely a man of opulence or independent fortune is to be met with. 'Agriculture is still in the condition 'it, was in some thousand years ago,' says, somewhat unadvisedly, one of our authors: but 'some thousand years ago' these same territories, on the contrary, supported a prodigious population where even the scattered Turkish villages suffer the horrors of periodical famine, and the splendid Empire of the Medes drew its treasures from the lands which will no longer support the impoverished government of the Sultan. The population is everywhere too scanty to cultivate the soil, yet the male inhabitants professing the Mussulman faith are almost

exclusively devoted to military service. The whole Moslem population is liable to be drawn for the army, and of those who are so drawn, not thirty-five per cent. ever return. The farmer is wholly without capital, and is commonly obliged to pledge his standing crops, at a loss of half their value. An attempt made last year by the government to lower the rate of interest in the agricultural districts to eight per cent., entirely failed; and the subsequent disappearance of the metallic currency has of course enhanced these evils. The want of roads is a complete bar to the transport of agricultural produce; and though the Turks continue to load every thing on the back of a donkey or a camel, from a hod of mortar to a cord of timber, a country in which every description of wheel carriage, down to the wheel-barrow, is still unknown, wants the first implements of rural industry. But the most significant fact connected with the land tenures of Turkey is, that at least two-thirds, and some writers say three-fourths, of the lands of the Empire are held in mortmain, as *vakuf*, by the mosques or pious and charitable institutions, either for their own use, or as trustees of the real owners. This property is subject neither to taxes nor to confiscation, and accordingly, it is a species of trust largely resorted to by private landowners, who transfer the fee simple of their property to the mosques, reserving only the usufruct to themselves and their heirs: on the extinction of the direct male line, the land passes to the charity.

‘Immovable property,’ says Dr. Michelsen, ‘which is not owned by these institutions, of which, consequently, the State is the owner, and the private individual the holder, is called *Mulk*. Landed property (land, houses, mines,) can, in Turkey, be possessed only by Turkish subjects. A *vakuf* can, by law, neither be sold nor alienated, and it is only by means of an abuse and quibbling with law terms that any other immovable property of a similar description (which has not been a *vakuf*) may be substituted for it. Neither is the resale of the *Mulk* subject to less ridiculous restrictions. Thus, for instance, a Turk may dispose of his landed property to a Turk alone, while the property of a *rayah* is so limited by various clauses as to render its sale to all but a Turk next to impossible. The sale of such property being thus limited to a very small number of buyers, and these not of a wealthy class, the value of landed property is greatly depressed; while in some few places, where the Franks find means to hold property, (apparently in the name of a Turk, but in reality for themselves,) the value is raised to an extraordinary and almost fabulous extent. Landed property at Pera and Galata, for instance, fetches much more than in London.’ (*Michelsen*, p. 178.)

This distinction may be considered to be the basis of the territorial and financial system of Turkey. Upon the conquest,

the lands of the Empire were divided into three classes,—a third for the mosques, a third for private landowners, and a third for the State. But the second or patrimonial division has been materially reduced, whilst the ecclesiastical portion has swallowed up the remainder. M. Ubicini describes the practice of these *vacufts* by the following example:—

‘Suppose Said to be the possessor of a real estate of 100,000 piastres, which he desires to secure from the rapacity of the Government, and to preserve for his direct issue. He cedes it to a mosque, which gives him in exchange a sum of 10,000 piastres; but this cession is fictitious. Said, by a payment of 15 per cent. on the sum he has received, or 1500 piastres a year, continues to retain the perpetual usufruct of his estate, with a power of transmitting it to his children. He is safe from all confiscations and from forced sales, either by his creditors or by virtue of the right recognised by Turkish law, which gives the owner of contiguous property a prior claim to purchase. But if Said dies without living children, even though he have grandchildren to represent them, the estate passes to the mosque. Thus the mosque is placed by this trust in the position of a man who purchases an estate for one-tenth of its value on condition of only entering into possession on the extinction of the lineal and direct issue of the vendor, receiving, however, 15 per cent. on the purchase-money in the interval. It may readily be conceived that this arrangement contributed formerly to multiply these trusts, inasmuch that *three-quarters of the landed property* of Turkey are thus pledged to the mosques, to the great detriment of the public revenue. (*Lettres sur la Turquie*, p. 270.)

These facts would almost suffice to account for the decay of the Empire. The fear of confiscation and the general insecurity of property have driven three quarters of the land into mortmain, where it is held by the double fangs of ecclesiastical power and legal subtlety, for in Mahomedan countries the lawyers are the priests. Being in this condition it ceases to contribute to the public revenue, except in the shape of certain objectionable taxes on produce, and it becomes inalienable. The only class in society who have the faculty of acquiring capital by industry are forbidden to invest it in real property, and the soil is carefully guarded against every change in cultivation or improvement. It is unnecessary to add, that wherever such laws as these are in existence, there can be no landed class able to take a part in the public service, or to supply men of independent position to serve the Government. Yet this state of things is based on the immemorial usages of the country and on the authority of the law of the Prophet; and it will probably remain unchanged as long as the Padischah is the sovereign of the country, and Mahomedanism the dominant religion and

law of the realm. If this be a correct description of the social condition of Turkey in this one particular, what are we to augur of its political institutions?

The government of the Ottoman Empire at the present time differs materially both in form and substance from what it has ever been before. The sovereigns of the House of Othman were, almost without exception, men of strong will and fierce despotic passions, wielding, without scruple, the tremendous power they possessed. If they wanted these essential qualities, they were soon removed by the Janizaries, who constituted what might be considered the military aristocracy of the empire. The destruction of the Janizaries in 1826 was incomparably the most important, as it was the most sanguinary act of Mahmoud's extraordinary reign, and, like the massacre of the Strelitz by Peter the Great, it was the precursor of a new era in the Empire. From that hour the Padischah wielded an absolute and uncontrolled authority, with which he braved even the religious denunciations of the ulemas and the prejudices of his subjects; yet this power withered in his grasp, and he bequeathed to a feeble son the feeble remnant of a mighty name. Abdul Medjid is a prince of singular mildness and benevolence of character, but utterly deficient in the intellectual and physical qualities of the ruler of a great nation. He soon became the mere nominal sovereign of the country, and all real power fell into the hands of the governing pashas, over whose gross corruption and incessant intrigues neither the law nor the authority of the Sultan exercise any control. The pashas constitute in reality a ruling caste, and all power is in their hands. Yet never was power more singularly obtained and distributed. With few exceptions (amongst which the names of Redschid Pasha and Fuad Effendi deserve honourable mention, as they are possessed of considerable cultivation), these pashas are men without the distinction or the advantages of birth, without independent fortune or position, often without the rudiments of education. They owe their rise to mere accident; some have entered life as the pipe-boy or favourite of a grandee, some have caught the eye of the Sultan as they sat working at their stall in a bazaar; a few have shown military ability. One of the most singular characteristics of Turkish society is the perfect equality held to prevail throughout the community. Every man is supposed to be equally qualified for every station, and the distinctions we draw in Europe from birth, education, or natural ability, are refinements utterly incomprehensible in the East. One man is a pasha, and another is a hamal or porter in the streets of Pera; but if they change places on the social ladder the result

is precisely the same, and no one is astonished at the rise of the one or at the fall of the other. Under this state of things, as no Mussulman makes his way in the world by the productive industry which secures wealth and consideration in other countries, all the importance he enjoys and all the luxuries he can command are due to the maintenance of his official position, or to the credit he derives from it. Hence there is not a public functionary in the country who is not openly accused of the grossest corruption, in addition to the large emoluments he draws from the state; and his life is spent, while in office, either in amassing plunder or in paying off the enormous debts contracted to Armenian scruffs under less favourable circumstances. The relaxation of the imperial authority and of public morality is such that no punishment whatever seems to fall on these offenders, though their Armenian accomplices are sometimes caught; and even the detection of a palpable fraud is not supposed to disqualify a man for holding the first office of the Empire a few months afterwards. For the same reason—an inordinate love and want of place—almost every one of these fortunate adventurers is more or less closely connected with one of the foreign embassies, and lends himself to foreign influence; and their course of action on the greatest questions of state is mainly regulated by considerations arising out of their own personal position, which commonly remain wholly unknown to the politicians of Europe. Nothing is more characteristic of this extraordinary system of spoliation than the proportion of official salaries to the general expenditure of the empire. Taking the revenue at about 7,000,000*l.* sterling—a sufficiently moderate burden on a population of 36,000,000, and an Empire which has about twice the superficial area of France—the pay of the public functionaries is estimated by Dr. Michelsen at 1,950,000*l.*, and the civil list of the Sultan and his family, at 834,000*l.*, without any allowance for the enormous underhand profits received by public servants of every class, by which probably one half the gross revenue of the state is abstracted before it reaches the treasury. Mr. White estimates the expenses of the imperial household at 1,250,000*l.*, or about one-fifth of the revenue of the empire. Well may Dr. Michelsen observe, in producing these figures, that ‘the Ottoman Empire, though it has now existed for more than five centuries, can scarcely be called a state, in the proper sense of the word. The government of the past five centuries represents a system which is in Constantinople very aptly described as a “Nizam Altyuda haidad”—an organised system of rapacity;’ and, in spite of some recent attempts at reform, we

believe this system to be unchanged, and that no effective system of control over the finances or of personal responsibility for public trusts is in existence.

The revenue is raised by the most vicious, unequal, and unproductive means. The principal source of income is a tithe of produce collected in kind in Roumelia and some parts of Asia, and commuted in the other provinces. Then comes an income-tax, varying in amount from 10 to 25 per cent., which is frequently imposed on the same produce that has already paid tithe. The capitation-tax, or Haratch, is paid by the Christians only, and is regarded by them as an insulting burden. The custom duties of the Empire produce only 750,000*l.* a year, and they constitute a further burden on the productive industry of the country; for whilst all merchandise imported into the Ottoman Empire pays a duty of 5 per cent. *ad valorem*, all merchandise exported from the Empire pays a duty of 12 per cent. These duties are still farmed by the Government, and the collection of the revenue is in the hands of gangs of Armenian speculators, who enrich themselves whilst they oppress the tax-payer and defraud the State. Laws have repeatedly been passed against these *malikianes*, as they are termed, but without effect, and the system remains unaltered. About five years ago, the customs of one large town were farmed for 1,500,000 piastres, and the contractor acknowledged he had gained a million piastres on his bargain. In the following year, he would have taken the farm at two millions and a half; but a member of the government obtained it for himself under the name of one of his servants, for 1,700,000; and then, wishing to realise his profits at once, made over his contract to the former holders for the sum they would have given for it. The State was thus robbed of 800,000 piastres; and the same abuses prevail in every rank of the financial agents. To take another instance quoted by M. Ubicini. The tithes of certain villages are farmed by auction. Some few days before the public tender, the great man of the district causes it to be known that he intends to bid for certain villages, and threatens with his high displeasure any one who may dispute them with him. The auction begins, and the farms are knocked down to the great man or his agent. The forms of the law have been strictly complied with. But when the public sale is over, the real transaction begins; the holder of the farms then proceeds to resell in retail the village tithes he has just purchased in a lump, and if he manages well he may succeed in realising a clear profit of 1,800,000 piastres on a sale of tithes to the value of two millions. These are not sup-

posed cases, but facts related by competent writers, who are defending what can be defended in Turkish institutions.

It has been justly observed by one of the numerous writers on the military defence of the Ottoman Empire, that to hold her vast territories, Turkey requires a good army, but that a good army cannot exist without good finances, or good finances without good administration. So another of the champions of the Sultan prescribes an admirable strategical scheme of defence, and adds, that all that is necessary to carry it into effect is a system of *good roads*; and this, in a country where nothing exists beyond a bullock track, even under the walls of the capital. In all these attempts to regenerate Turkey, the improvements have begun at the wrong end. As long as the laws and governing class are unchanged, it is impossible that the land should be other than a wilderness, the revenue honestly paid, or judiciously employed, or the rights of society protected. The present state of things is a scramble for private advantages of the lowest kind, and the idea of public duty to the collective interests of the Empire has scarcely a representative in the service of the Grand Signior.

Upon what basis, then, can the government of such a community be said to rest, when the idea of absolute power, founded on a divine commission, and defended by all the rigour of sanguinary force, has ceased to exist? The distinctions of birth are totally unknown: no family exists in the empire but that of the sovereign; and even family names are wanting. The distinction of permanent hereditary wealth is equally rare in a country where, till very recently, property has been habitually insecure, and where ample possessions usually caused the ruin of their owner and the downfall of his house. Every man who takes a part in public affairs belongs to that vast and rapacious tribe of functionaries who devour the revenue of the State, and the resources of the Empire. His career is diversified by plunder and prodigality while he is in power, and by debts contracted on ruinous terms when out of office. In the midst of the present crisis, and at a moment when every piastre in the imperial treasury was supposed to be devoted to preparation for war, it is a well authenticated fact, that the minister on whom the burden of public affairs mainly rested, availed himself of his vast influence to cause the Sultan to pay his private debts to an amount of 22 million piastres, or nearly 200,000*l.*, by allying his son to the imperial family.

The distinction of superior education, experience, or ability, is equally rare. Few statesmen of education exist in the country, for what the modern school of Turks claim to know

has been picked up abroad, and their superiority is viewed with neither favour or respect by their Mussulman countrymen. At this very time one of the ablest men in the Empire, Aali Pasha, is not in office, and Fuad Effendi has only been employed as commissioner to the forces. The truth is, that the choice of ministers, the ascendancy of one set of men over another, and the distribution of the vast patronage of the Empire, which is the sole support of the dominant class, are all regulated by party intrigues little known in Europe, and changes which have spread consternation and astonishment abroad may frequently be traced at Stamboul to the lowest vices and meanest passions of humanity. In the present state of affairs at the Porte all these intrigues are wholly unchecked. The Sultan is apathetic, kind-hearted, and easily deceived, and the time is past when the favourite of to-day might have his head struck off on the morrow. The pashas have the government in their own hands. They form a species of bastard oligarchy, limited only by the fanaticism of the ulemas and the exactions of the law, and, like all oligarchies, they govern solely with a view to the maintenance of their own power. To the honour of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe and of English diplomacy it must be said, that means have been found to turn even these contemptible instruments towards the improvement of the country, and to obtain from them those gradual concessions for the Christian population which will one day raise them, we hope, to the level of free men. The claim of Russia to a protectorate of the Christians in Turkey is the more monstrous, since every measure adopted of late years for their benefit has originated with the English or French embassies, and has been opposed by the Russian agents. Thus, in spite of the most untoward circumstances, the cause of reform in Turkey advanced, but it advanced by the weakness of the government rather than by its strength, and the efforts of the Divan to carry into effect some of its most praiseworthy measures were almost as injurious to its power and stability as the attacks to which it was exposed from without. The honourable refusal of the Sultan to deliver up the Hungarian fugitives who had sought shelter in his dominions was the cause of an interruption of his friendly relations with the Court of Vienna, and, perhaps, laid the first seed of that resentment which Russia has since manifested by the most violent measures. The attempt of the Porte to enforce the *Tanzimat* in Bosnia led to the revolt of that province in 1850, when Omar Pasha succeeded in crushing the insurrection by force of arms, but, at the same time, he destroyed the last remains of the power of those Bosnian sipahis who had been

for ages one of the best elements in the military force of the empire. The loan negotiated in 1852 in Paris and London under the auspices of the Greek envoys of the Porte in those cities, might have improved the financial condition of the empire, and would have strengthened the interest of Western Europe in its preservation ; but, after the payment of the first instalment, the contract was annulled, and the money returned, whilst Prince Cantacuzene, one of the ablest diplomatic servants of the Sultan, was disgraced for no fault of his own. Power in the Divan fluctuated between bigoted, incapable, or corrupt ministers, and each succeeding month increased the difficulty of the question how an empire of so vast a frame, and so faint a vitality, was to be governed, or even preserved in existence.

Such have been the results of the experiment for the reform of Turkish institutions begun by Sultan Mahmoud, and continued during the reign of his son. But, though these reforms have not produced all the beneficial results anticipated from them, it cannot for a moment be contended that the old system of Turkish government could have been maintained. The struggle with Greece was the last effort of that merciless and barbarous domination, which was terminated for ever by the massacre of the Janizaries and the battle of Navarino. The time was past when Europe would endure to witness the subjection of a Christian people by means which perpetually reminded the world of the ferocity of the Turkish conquest, and the reigning Sultan himself accepted and ratified the new policy which raised his Christian subjects to the rank of human beings. They were emancipated by the Hatti Scheriff of Gulhani from the degrading conditions under which their forefathers had groaned since the middle of the fifteenth century. They have advanced with uncommon rapidity in industry and intelligence. Yet many of the most important franchises of social life are still withheld from them. The tenor of landed property by Rayahs is, as we have already seen, thwarted by Mahomedan law, and it is absolutely prohibited to all foreign Christians. The testimony of Christians is not received in mixed causes before the Turkish tribunals, and the great bulk of the population of the empire in Europe is thus degraded to the level of the negroes of Kentucky. This enormous abuse has lately been warmly attacked by Lord Stratford, and there is reason to hope that the firman abolishing so shameful a distinction has actually been signed, but there is a wide gulf between the signature of these firmans and their execution by the local authorities. The Haratch, or capitation tax, is still levied on the Christians in the most odious and insulting form, though a larger revenue

might doubtless be raised on a fair assessment of the country. And, lastly, the Christians are not permitted to bear arms in the service of the Government. An army which cannot move a step without the aid of Christian officers or renegades has not till now admitted a Christian soldier into its ranks, and the whole burden of war is thus thrown on the declining Mussulman population. These four causes constitute the primary grievances of the Christian races, and they are the key to endless injustice and oppression. Without those rights no people can advance beyond the limits of mere toleration; yet with them the Greek and Slavonian races would in a few years become the possessors of the soil and the lords of the Empire. Much as we desire to witness the progress of these liberal measures, it is impossible to suppose that such concessions would contribute to prolong the existence of a power founded on the exclusive domination of an armed minority, inferior in every other faculty to the people they govern. The Turks themselves are not insensible to their true position, and they say, with some reason, in answer to the demand made on them for further acts of toleration, ‘Why should we grant further privileges to the Christians? Oppressed as they are, and excluded from a direct share in the government, they alone find means to flourish amongst the desolation and poverty of the land. They are our creditors; we their debtors.’ The most luxurious palaces on the Bosphorus are those of the Greek and Armenian families, except where those splendid abodes have been wrested from them by confiscation, and transferred to Turkish functionaries; and, although the scorn of the true believer for the infidel has only decreased in proportion to the decline of his own faith, he feels every year the increasing influence of the Christian races over the empire, and is perpetually reminded of the dependence of the whole of society on those members of it whom it still proscribes. This state of things has been repeatedly described by all the recent writers who have observed the state of Turkey, and we may borrow the following extract from Mr. White’s ‘Three Years in Constantinople’ as a fair *résumé* of the case:—

‘The motives that led to the framing of the Gul Khana edict, and the project of thereby reforming the administrative system of the Turkish Empire, were doubtless most praiseworthy. They were the creation of a benevolent and liberal mind, but not of a political economist conversant with the counter prejudices and correlative position of the vast majority of his fellow-countrymen, or with the objects and restless ambition of the minority. Before changing the character of the connexion between rulers and people *individually*,

and, above all, before attempting to imitate foreign institutions, it was essential to have considered how far these changes and imitations were applicable to the subjects of the Sublime Porte *collectively*. When the administrative reforms, now found to be impracticable or subversive, were introduced by Reschid Pasha, and applauded by Europe, when the representatives of European states became sponsors to these reforms, this preliminary investigation and forecalculation seem to have been neglected. The sponsors, carried away by over-liberal and philanthropic sentiment, looked upon the edict as a source of tranquillity and union between all classes of the Sultan's subjects, and its applauders reasoned as generous minds would naturally reason at a distance. Neither, however, appeared to have weighed the consequences with the consideration of men conversant with the elements of dissolution inherent in the projected reforms. Thence the necessity for modification and abandonment, and thence, in a great measure, the complaints of retrocession perceptible in the acts of the Ottoman Government within the last two years. Many of those best acquainted with the internal condition and component fractions of the Ottoman Empire have now modified their opinions. They are for the most part convinced that if it were considered useful and perhaps necessary to introduce some of the administrative *principles* in force in European states, it was impolitic and even dangerous to adopt the forms of these states, and above all, those of France.

How different from that of France, or of any other European state, is the composition of the Turkish Empire! Its population consists of several distinct races utterly opposed to each other in religion, habits, descent, objects, and in every moral and even physical characteristic. The Turkomans, Kurds, Hurruks, Arabs, Egyptians, Druses, Mutawellys, Maronites, Albanians, Bosnians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Jews, and Armenians are so many distinct nations, who inhabit the same or contiguous soils without having intermixed in the slightest degree from their earliest conquest, and without having a single object in common. Indeed, in lieu of exhibiting the slightest signs of approachment or fraternisation, their mutual jealousies and distrusts daily increase.

Over these dissident populations stands the pure Ottoman race, the paramount nation, charged with maintaining the equilibrium between all and with neutralising the ascendancy of one fraction by the aid of others. Were this control not to exist—were the Turks, who represent their ancestors the conquerors of the land, to be reduced to a level with those beneath them, or were the preponderating influence of the former to be destroyed by the elevation and equalisation of the latter, perpetual revolts and civil war would not fail to ensue. The dependent populations now constituting so large a portion of the empire would continue the struggle until one of them obtained the supremacy at present exercised by the Turkish race, or until the territory were divided among themselves or parcelled out by foreign Powers. Province after province would be lopped off from the empire, as already exemplified in Wallachia, Moldavia, and Servia, and this, with the sanction and under the protectorate of

powers the most clamorous for institutions replete with these elements of dissolution.

'The dangers that would menace the stability of the Sultan's authority present themselves under other forms than those above mentioned. Should the line of demarcation which now separates the different component parts be removed—should a closer connexion take place between the jealous and rival populations now subjected to the domination of the Porte—should the mutual aversions that now separate them be softened by equality of privileges—should all be raised to the same standard as their masters—it is to be feared that they would soon come to an understanding, and unite against the Turkish race, of which all are equally jealous, and against which all entertain the same sentiments of ill will and animosity. Many benevolent men argue that the surest means of tranquillising the tributaries of the Porte, and of attaching them to the Government, is by raising them in the social scale, and by granting to all the same rights and immunities as are enjoyed by the rulers. But it has been repeatedly proved, that concessions do but lead to fresh demands, and that partial enfranchisement conduces to total emancipation. Besides, when commerce, industry, intelligence, knowledge, activity, rapidly augmenting population,—in short, all the ingredients and incentives to progress and liberty are on one side, and when comparative ignorance, prejudice, apathy, aversion to speculation and foreign trade, with stationary population are the characteristics of the other, it is fair to argue that many years would not elapse before the progressing fractions would take the lead, and rulers and ruled would change places.'

In a word, the contest which is going on is that of civilisation and barbarism, of legislative rights and arbitrary power, of Christianity and Islamism, of the races of Europe and the races of Asia, and it is only by the maintenance of conditions the most onerous to the cause of numbers, of truth, of progress, and of freedom, that the balance can for a moment be maintained. Place the Christians and the Mahomedans of Turkey in Europe on terms approaching to equality, and the result would not be doubtful for a single year. Thus far the question may be said to have advanced, that few statesmen will now be found to advocate the justice of such a state of things in the abstract, though they still cling to the expediency of a system of government which can only be preserved by means that every free and civilised man must abhor.

But in reality the expression by which this state of things is diplomatically described has long ceased to have any true meaning. The integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire became little more than a conventional form of words from the moment it was used to describe, not the actual condition of Turkey, but the forbearance of Europe. Already province

after province had been torn from the Ottoman dominions. The Crimea was lost; Bessarabia is incorporated with Russia, and her frontier advanced to the Pruth; from Moldo-Wallachia the last remnant of the Mussulman race has been expelled by treaty; Servia has a government and constitution of her own; Greece has been made a kingdom; Algeria a French province; Syria has only been restored to the Sultan by a party of British marines; and the tenure of Egypt is that of all but independent alliance. In a word, the Porte has already lost what she could not defend; and her losses would have been greater but for the support she has received from Europe. But that support has compromised her independence, whilst it has saved a part of her dominions. The contest now going on at Constantinople is not so much a *bonâ fide* assertion of the independence of the Porte, as a struggle between the supremacy rashly claimed by Russia and the influence which the Western Powers are pledged not to relinquish. If it were possible to penetrate the secrets which diplomacy prudently conceals from the world, we should be curious to ask which of the Turkish state papers have been written by Mussulman plenipotentiaries, which of the important measures lately taken originated with the Divan, except, indeed, when they used their independence to defeat the pacific labours of Europe, and to draw the Christian Powers as nearly as possible to a state of war which threatens to engulf themselves? Much that has been said and done in the name of the Turkish Government has been exceedingly able, politic, and judicious; but we are surprised that any of the politicians who have warmly espoused their cause should have been deceived by so palpable a contrivance. It is the old fable reversed, and the lion is hunting in the ass's skin. If these exotic and adventitious aids were withdrawn, we doubt not only whether Turkey would resist Russia for another campaign, but whether the Empire itself would hold together as long. The very facts which are now alleged in support of the independence of Turkey are proofs of her entire dependence on foreign counsels; and the only favourable solution of this problem which we can imagine, would be that these foreign counsels should gradually so transform the Empire that a Christian state, capable of self-government and of self-defence, should be formed on what we must now term its ruins.

We are thus led to consider the state of the Ottoman Empire as it is; and the story is not a new one. We see a once mighty and formidable state in great weakness, from the gradual but steady decline of that dominant race which founded its authority and alone defended its power. If the Government has recourse

to its Christian subjects, by extending to them equal civil rights, and by including them in its armies, their superior numbers and intelligence would ere long overwhelm the Turks, and the Empire of Islam in Europe would be at an end. Depressed by the failure of its original powers, and not daring to throw itself upon the doubtful allegiance of the Christian population, its last resource is in foreign succour. And this succour is afforded it, not so much because we are interested in the preservation of Turkish despotism and Mussulman supremacy, as because Europe cannot permit that these institutions should be swept away only to make room for the despotism and the religious supremacy of Russian Czars and the Russo-Greek Church. On that point we are perfectly agreed with the most strenuous supporters of the Ottoman Empire; but we agree with them because, behind the fallacious and questionable 'integrity and independence' of Turkey, there is a real interest of paramount importance to Europe, namely, the independence and future welfare of the territories and races over which the Turk still holds sway. They will remain long after the crescent has ceased to glitter on this side the Hellespont; they must form a state, under whatever name, which is every year more closely allied to the interests of Europe; and to determine the nature and form of that state now or hereafter is the greatest problem with which the statesmen of our age have to deal.

But here again the question is complicated by several irreconcilable elements. The Christian population of Turkey in Europe (for it is to that part of the empire that our remarks are chiefly addressed) is divided into the two great classes of the Slavonian and the Greek races, neither of which can govern the other; and the position of the Slavonian provinces is rendered still more perplexing by the fact that there are in Bosnia 700,000 or 800,000 European Mussulmans, originally converted to Islamism by Turkish conquest, but now justly reckoned amongst the most brave and fanatical of true believers. That province is, indeed, the only instance in which Mahomedanism seems to have engrafted itself with any firm hold on a European stock, and there the martial ardour of a people nearly connected with the Croats and Pandours is allied to the ferocity of that most intolerant creed. In a neighbouring principality, however, one experiment of self-government has been made with success. The condition of Servia is far superior to that of any other province still tributary to the Porte. With the exception of the investiture of the Prince, the annual tribute, and the garrison of six fortified places, Turkey is debarred by treaty from all interference in that country, and no Mussulman can inhabit its

soil. Accordingly the progress of Servia has been rapid. Institutions have been framed, peculiar in their character, but adapted to the manners of the people; the revenue is flourishing; the government is popular; and this province forms the strongest contrast to the general condition of the Empire. Possibly there may be in Servia the nucleus of an independent Christian state, for although the people are strongly hostile to the slightest approximation to Turkey, and would declare in favour of Russia if pressed to take part in this war, yet they are no servile adherents of Russia; and the views of the leading Servians are much more directed to an extension of their own political rights over the neighbouring territories. In these provinces the same idea, under the name of the Illyrian kingdom, has been most earnestly propagated, and the elements of a revolution, or declaration of independence, exist there, alike opposed to Russian ascendancy and to Turkish authority.

These races, however, inhabit the least civilised portion of this quarter of the globe. They have frequently displayed their hereditary valour in the ranks of the imperial armies, and under different standards, but many centuries have passed away since their national existence was absorbed in the torrent of Mahomedan conquest, and they have yet to reconquer a place in the civilised world. Not so the Greeks. In spite of centuries of servitude and persecution, in spite of the oppression which has too often degraded them into the tools and sycophants of their masters, in spite of the vices which bad government has added to their natural failings, they remain, beyond all comparison, the most intelligent, enterprising, and energetic people of Eastern Europe, and they are hourly becoming more impatient for emancipation and independence. Thirty years have not yet elapsed since the sudden uprising of the Greek race filled the world with astonishment and enthusiasm. The most adventurous of our soldiers joined the Christian colours; the most romantic of our poets wrote and died in their cause; and the heroic achievements of that band of patriots burst at last through all the obstacles of a Tory government and the Holy Alliance: the Greek revolution was recognised by Europe, — Europe declared that Greece should be free. When that memorable decision was taken the fate of the East of Europe was decided; and no subsequent wavering of policy will reverse the decree. It is true that on both sides much has occurred to shake the faith of Europe, and especially of this country, in the Greek cause. We ourselves are not the least culpable parties. We concurred in the selection of an incapable prince, foreign alike to the creed and the manners of the people; we surrounded his boyhood with

a regency of Bavarian councillors who quarrelled from the day they set foot at Nauplia; we encumbered his finances with a loan, small part of which was spent for the benefit of Greece; we narrowed the frontiers of the new kingdom so as to exclude from it many of the most famous and gallant champions of the national cause, such as Samos, Chio, and Suli, and to reduce its resources to the smallest limits. Having done all this, Athens has ever since been made the scene of contemptible intrigues between the three Powers, in which our envoys have not always played a conciliatory part. On the other hand, the conduct of the Greeks has frequently been unwise, sometimes scandalous. The Court has given its confidence to what is least honourable in the country; and the state of the kingdom of Greece is far below what it ought to be—below even the condition of some of the Greek islands still under the Turkish dominion.

But this temporary and partial failure of an experiment of twenty years,—a short fraction of time in the annals of a people which dates from Cecrops,—is a mere speck on the general question. The Greeks themselves, both within the frontiers of the kingdom and beyond it, think of King Otho and his court as we do, but they do not consider him as any permanent obstacle to their progress. At present the chief indication of that progress is their astonishing aptitude for commerce. Throughout the Levant an incredible activity prevails among the Greek traders. Towns have sprung up on islands depopulated by the war, vessels are built, large firms are established, and the entire business of the Levant is in their hands. Not content with these undertakings, they have thrown out their branches to the ends of the earth, with an energy which we can only compare to that of our fellow-countrymen in this portion of the island. More than sixty Greek houses now in London form a commercial colony of the first importance, which has possessed itself of the whole trade of the Levant, and of four-fifths of the foreign corn trade of England; and in spite of the equivocal character attached to the Greeks in the East, where every man lives more or less by plunder or fraud, it is worthy of remark that on English soil these houses have established a high character for honesty, and not one of them, we believe, has been wanting to its engagements. From London they have advanced to Manchester for their supplies of cotton goods; and, more recently, to Rio Janeiro, Calcutta, and Australia. Similar colonies have been formed at Marseilles, Trieste, and Odessa; and the operations of these houses, all retaining some connexion with Greece, are becoming an important element in the commerce of the world.

What will occur in the next generation, when the sons of these merchants find themselves already rich by the labours of their family, educated in the arts and liberties of the West, yet attached by their lineage and their ambition to their Greek country? Already the monied resources of this class of Greeks furnish resources, not illiberally provided, for the future struggles of their country, since they are the only people of the East (except the Jews) who can be said to have wealth at their command. Nor are they deficient in the strongest feelings of patriotism. Not one of them looks with indifference to the time when the Christian races of the East will be free, and the Christian Church of the East mistress of her ancient domain. At this time, especially, throughout the Greek population of those lands, and amongst their countrymen all over the world, there is a deep-rooted conviction that the day of their great struggle and final victory is at hand. As opposed to the Turks, the hereditary enemies of their faith and their nation, the wishes of the Greeks are, we believe, almost to a man, with the Russians in the present contest. But it must not be imagined on that account that they are the more disposed to exchange the yoke of Turkey for that of Russia, or to accept any condition but that of national independence. Their commercial interests, based on freedom of trade,—their maritime pursuits, which connect them with the Western Powers,—their Church government, which will never submit to recognise the supremacy of the Russian Synod,—and their geographical position, always accessible to the fleets and forces of England and France,—are causes that sever them from the dominion of Russia; and we confidently affirm that no means of government Russia has yet exhibited to the world would retain her authority over the Greek people. Their own energy and the interests of the Western Powers will secure their independence; but not all the counsels and remonstrances of the allied powers will suffice to prolong their subjection to Turkey; and the first opportunity afforded by a reverse of the Ottoman armies will probably be responded to from the Acroceraunian mountains to the Archipelago, by a people who have shown before this how they can fight for their freedom.

There is yet another characteristic of the modern Greeks, interesting at once from its analogy to their past history and as an indication of their rapid improvement. They are the only people of the Levant who attach a lively importance to education. We have seen that the attempts to instruct the Turks in the acquirements, the arts, and the military exercises of Europe end as they began, by the forced labours of a few im-

ported masters and the superficial distinction of a few reluctant scholars. The Slavonian provinces are comparatively barbarous, or tinged only with the morality of French novels and the politics of French communism. But in Greece education is a passion in almost all ranks of society. The primary schools are excellent, and assiduously frequented. The university of Athens is already in possession of a distinguished body of professors. The Greek language is spoken and written with far greater purity and elegance than it was twenty years ago; the use of foreign corruptions is viewed with scorn by educated Greeks; and the original language of Homer and the New Testament may be said to be the basis of the instruction of this people. There are examples in Athens of peasants who have come in from the fields to take domestic service in the city without wages, asking no remuneration but leave to attend a school two hours a day. King Otho's government has done little or nothing to promote or assist this laudable enthusiasm, and amongst the favourites of the Court, and even the Ministers of the Crown, there are still men who can scarcely write their names. But in this, as in other respects, the government is a libel on the country, and it is easy to foresee what must be the ultimate consequence of this ardour of intelligence and this feverish activity of the Greek character, when opposed to races sunk in total apathy, and degraded by profound ignorance. It is doubtless in the interest of the Christian population of the East to check as far as possible any premature attempt to secure their emancipation, which might, if it failed, defeat the progress of measures calculated to improve their condition by pacific means. Indeed, the happiest solution of the Eastern question would be the gradual transformation of the Ottoman Empire by the concession of equal rights to the Christians, until, to use the expression of a Prussian diplomatist, 'Il ne resterait plus qu'au Grand Seigneur de se faire Chrétien.' But the Turks are too well aware of their own inferiority in every particular except that of military force to place their ascendancy at the mercy of their Christian subjects. The Rayahs subjects are still too much exposed to every species of oppression and insult to endure this yoke one hour after they think they can shake it off. Habits of toleration and decrees of equality are a dead letter beyond the diameter of the capital; and we venture to affirm that more acts of cruelty and extortion are still perpetrated in the Turkish Empire than in all those countries of Europe which habitually inspire us with the strongest commiseration. Within the last ten years wholesale massacres of Christians have taken place in

Asia Minor. The slave-trade is still carried on upon a large scale, in spite of the prohibition of it by law; for the menial servants of Constantinople are negroes imported from Northern Africa, and the white slave-trade in Circassian girls still flourishes amongst the crimps and panders of Tophana. Nay, even the domestic hearth of the Greek subjects of Turkey cannot secure their daughters from the last insults, and many a Greek girl is still consigned to the soul-debasing captivity of the Harem under the pretence that she has renounced the faith of her fathers, and embraced that creed which dooms her to perdition. A conversion to Islamism, whether forced or voluntary, extinguishes all the ties of nature itself.

The safety and the policy of all Europe require a barrier against Russia; and it is a maxim of permanent interest to the British Empire that she should not extend her territorial jurisdiction over the East, or acquire a maritime power continually threatening the Mediterranean states and the road to India. But of what materials is that barrier to be composed? Can we expect that any permanent resistance to one of the first military empires of the world will be offered by a state with an anomalous and corrupt government, a declining population, exhausted finances, and a half-organised army? The barrier against the encroachments and ambition of Russia or any other Power must undoubtedly be raised on the soil now possessed by the Turks, but it will never be secure until it be defended by a fresh, vigorous, and intelligent people. For, we repeat, the Christian populations of the East have no intention to change one oppressive form of government for another; and though they may borrow the aid of the Russians to shake off the yoke of the Turks, they are not more disposed to be the subjects of the Czar than of the Sultan. It is a common error to suppose that the analogy which exists between the Church of Russia and the Churches of the East is a powerful bond between these communities and the Russian Crown. The Emperor of Russia himself, in claiming the protectorate of Greek subjects of the Porte, as a right due to the ancient solicitude of the Czars for the whole Eastern Church, attempted to give weight to this delusion. But nothing can be further from the truth. The strongest characteristic of the Eastern Churches is their national spirit, in which they resemble our own; but they differ from the Church of England by the entire independence of their ecclesiastical authority, as exercised by the Patriarchs and Synods of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, to which must now be added the Synod of Athens. These Churches assert,

and have ever asserted, from the days of the seven first Œcumenic Councils, their equal and independent rights; but on that ground, much more than on the narrow question of doctrinal difference, they denied the supremacy of Rome, and to this hour their detestation of the Papacy is as bitter as it has been in any former period. Does any one suppose that a clergy of a people who resist to the death the supremacy of Rome, will accept the supremacy of the Synod of St. Petersburg? or, that a Church, boasting of independent government by its Patriarchs from apostolic times, and even through the dark ages of Turkish bondage, will acknowledge the Emperor of Russia to be its head, or submit to the Erastian condition of the Russian establishment? Throughout the Eastern populations, both Slavonian and Greek, these religious elements have undoubtedly enormous power. There, far more than in Western Europe, they are likely to become the guiding principle of great political events. But, dear as the Churches are to the faith of the people, they are not less dear as the symbols of national independence; and from that point of view, neither Greeks nor Slavonians are more ready to merge their apostolic confession in the ecclesiastical ordinances of St. Petersburg or Moscow, which they justly regard as Churches of inferior rank and antiquity, than they would be to place themselves under the control of the Russian police or the dreadful conscription of the Russian army. On the contrary, if these countries were emancipated from the Turk and in possession of a free church and a free constitution, it is probable that their independence would be as zealously defended against Russian supremacy, as against the insidious aggressions of Rome. The Church of the East has at all times repudiated the subjection of her liberties to foreign authority, and whilst Rome centralised the Western world, she lost her control over the oldest Churches of Christendom. The discipline of the Latin Church is a formidable weapon in the hands of those powers which have sought to crush the traditions of national freedom; but the Greek Churches have, on the contrary, successfully defied every form of central authority which has been directed against them, and when every other species of independence was lost, the Church still preserved the existence of the nation.

We support the Turkish Government against the unjust pretensions of Russia, and we do well, because we cannot be indifferent to the destruction of that concert of the Great Powers which has prevailed for many years in the affairs of the East; we cannot assent to the forcible detention by Russia of a foreign territory; and we cannot admit that she has claims to

the protection of the Christian subjects of Turkey superior to those of the other Christian Powers. But our position is one of extreme difficulty ; for it cannot be the policy of England or France to throw the Christian subjects of Turkey entirely into the arms of Russia by backing the high Mussulman party in its unqualified resistance to demands made ostensibly and speciously for their benefit. On the contrary, the high Mussulman party are our habitual opponents, and Redschid Pasha has in all his successive ministries been their constant antagonist. In that capacity he was considered during the past summer to be the Minister most favourable to peace, and most awake to the dangers of the war which the ulemas and his own political rivals were resolved to provoke. In the course of these negotiations, Redschid Pasha seems to have discovered, however, that the war party was getting too strong for him, and he had not the moral courage, perhaps he had not the physical force, to resist the storm which was rising against him in the Divan, and even, as was said, among the people. Towards the close of September he convoked an assembly of an almost unprecedented character in Turkey, for it consisted of no less than 172 of the chief officers of the state and the heads of the law. No doubt existed as to the decision of such a body. It was, in fact, unanimous—that is, the opinion of the minority was unexpressed. The ministers retained office, but they remained to execute the designs of their rivals, and to pursue all the hazards of war. The mosques were ready to open their stores ; the treasure reserved for the sacred cause of war against the infidel was appropriated to the public service ; and Omar Pasha took the field at the head of an army far exceeding in numbers and in discipline the expectations of the friends of Turkey or the apprehensions of her enemies. Thus far his operations have not been defeated, and we are unwilling to predict a too speedy reverse. But it is not the less true that the extreme war party, directed by the ulemas, has prevailed, not only over the more cautious policy of Redschid Pasha, but even over the intentions of the Christian Powers ; and that we shall, ere long, have to consider the effect of this policy, not only on the quarrel with Russia, but on the Christian populations of the Empire. Whatever may be the abilities of Omar Pasha, it may be said of him as was said of the far more brilliant triumphs of Heraclius, that the Empire has been rather exhausted than exercised by these efforts. Troops have every where been withdrawn from the provinces ; in many parts of the country a total want of security and authority already prevails ; and as soon as the Ottoman forces meet with any serious

reverse, they will probably find that the Russians are not their most formidable enemies. If such a movement on the part of the Christian populations does take place, as we may anticipate that sooner or later it will take place, it would become impossible for the two most enlightened states of Western Europe to support the cause of Mahomedanism, despotism, and barbarism, against the just demands and growing strength of an overwhelming majority of the people. This, we shall be told, is not the present question. True, but it lies behind it, and in close connexion with it: and with a view to the permanent settlement of the East, it is of more importance perhaps than the recent aggressions of Russia. Indeed, if we were to seek any deep-seated political motive for the extraordinary proceedings of the Russian Cabinet towards the Porte, it might perhaps be found in the increasing evidence that the Christian populations of the south were outgrowing in intelligence and wealth the tutelary power Russia has assumed over them. We need hardly express our concurrence in all measures necessary to keep the Russians *out* of Constantinople, and to resist the pretensions they have raised. But we are not bound by the same considerations to keep the Turks *in*. On the contrary, it is the weakness of the Turks which alone makes the Russians formidable; and though the Ottoman Empire has been for ages in possession of the finest regions and the strongest positions in the world, the use it has made of those splendid territories is such that its existence has seemed for the last few months to depend on the presence of a squadron from a foggy island in the North Sea. What we desire to see is a powerful and independent State, not being Russian, in possession of those magnificent dominions, which are formed by nature for commerce, for empire, and for the happiness of mankind. But it is utterly chimerical to suppose that a nation whose presence in those regions has literally blasted the natural fertility of the soil, and which is debarred from all real change or improvement by the fundamental obligations of its religion and its laws, can become such a State. Turkey has been kept alive by the injection of Christian blood, but her own life-spring is already cold. The last quality she retains is that dogged valour and enthusiastic contempt for life which has never yet failed her soldiers in presence of an enemy.

It will be inferred from the opinions we have expressed on the present condition of the Ottoman Empire, which are derived from the concurring testimony of all the writers and travellers who appear to us most deserving of credit, that we are not disposed to regard with much confidence the first successes of

Omar Pasha's army on the Danube, and that His Abdul Medjid appears to us to have assumed the title of 'Ef-Ghaji,' the Victorious, with rather too much precipitation. Omar Pasha's movements have been viewed with a good deal of superficial enthusiasm by the daily press, for although they were certainly creditable to that general and to the Turkish troops, they amount in reality to little more than an affair of outposts, in which the Turks repulsed an attack on their entrenched position at Oltenitza, covered by batteries which were quite unassailable as long as they fired across the Danube. As yet the Turks have attempted no field manœuvres in the presence of the enemy, and although, like all Orientals, they are very formidable behind an entrenched position, the result of a campaign depends on a power of movement which they are not yet shown to possess. Their chiefs, however, seem perfectly aware that the greatest danger to which they are exposed would be that of fighting a general action in an open country, where their artillery would be less effective, and the want of cavalry would be more severely felt. The gorgeous old cavalry of the Ottomans, splendid in horses and arms, skilful in the use of the scimitar, and irresistible in a charge, is totally extinct; and the attempt to substitute for it a bastard European light cavalry, armed with lances and riding with long stirrups, has failed. The cavalry is the worst part of the Turkish army; its equipments are wretched; and the men, incapable of learning our modes of equitation and exercise, can hardly keep their seats. Omar Pasha has repeatedly stated to European officers that he rests the fate of his campaign on Schumla, and there is no doubt that the position now occupied by his centre in the triangle formed by Schumla, Silistria, and Rustchuk, or by Silistria, Schumla, and Varna, is one of immense strength. Schum itself is an entrenched camp capable of receiving a large army, admirably situated, and judiciously defended by art; but it is not equally certain that it may not be turned, and the Russians will not again sit down before it, if they can do otherwise. If the issue of the war rested on military operations to be carried on by the Russians against that position and the fortified passes of the Balkan, we should be fully prepared for a protracted resistance, and very probably a failure on the part of the assailant. But there are other lines of operation open to an invading army; there is the increasing danger of insurrection amongst the Christian populations and the progressive exhaustion of the Turkish Government.

The reconquest of the Danubian principalities by the Turkish arms alone is an idle dream; and what their future condition

will be must depend on the general results of the war. To Turkey herself, since the loss of the Crimca and of Bessarabia, these principalities have been rather a burden than an advantage. She draws from them no troops, and the tribute, which was somewhat irregularly paid up, has proved a most inadequate compensation for the expense of defending them. They have imposed on the Porte all the most onerous duties of sovereignty, with no corresponding advantage to its own interests. The reason, indeed, for which they have been so long retained, seems chiefly that they were regarded as a sort of appanage by the great families of the Fanariote Greeks, who used to conduct the foreign relations of the Porte, and the first dragoman of the Porte was frequently promoted to the office of Hospodar. It was remarked long ago by Baron de Beaujour in his excellent '*Voyage Militaire dans l'Empire Ottoman*,' that the possession of the principalities and the necessity of defending them was a great cause of weakness to Turkey, and that the military strength of the empire would be materially increased when drawn within limits more fitted by nature to resist invasion. The interest of Europe and the interest of Turkey herself is not that these provinces should retain their anomalous and embarrassing connexion with the Porte, but that they should *not be Russian*; and the Porte would gain far more by the interposition of an independent barrier between her dominions and the Russian frontier than by the maintenance of a profitless supremacy which cannot be defended against Russian attack. It would be highly desirable that these provinces should, for their own sake, and for that of their neighbours, obtain a more definite political constitution under the protection of the public law of Europe; for however little they may fall within the grasp of Turkey, we assume it to be clear that Russia will not be suffered to annex those provinces to her empire, if the rest of Europe can prevent it. They are already the granary from which a large proportion of the corn imported and consumed by the more densely peopled states of Western Europe is obtained. Nothing can exceed the productive power of the soil, but such is the want of roads that the transport of a load of wheat from the neighbourhood of Bucharest to the nearest port on the Danube, a distance of some fifty miles, costs as much as its freight to England. Moreover, these unhappy countries have scarcely ever enjoyed ten consecutive years of tranquillity, but have perpetually suffered all the hardships of war from Russian occupations, forced contributions, and Turkish retaliation. The protection Russia affects to have secured to them consists in little more than in making them the scene of her encroach-

ments; and the result of the present struggle will probably decide whether they are to be permanently annexed to her empire, or whether they are to be effectually preserved from these attacks.

The question which the Emperor Nicholas has unadvisedly raised no longer lies between himself and Turkey; for since he rests his claims on the necessity of protecting the Christian subjects of the Porte, that is a right and a duty in which other Christian Powers concede no precedence to Russia. There is, however, this important difference, that we think ourselves entitled to require that Christians shall be protected *by* the Porte, under whose government they are born; Russia has attempted to protect them *against* the Porte, which is their sovereign. Hitherto it is deserving of observation, as a fact creditable to the Turkish Government, that in the course of the preparations for this war, and even amidst the excitement of actual hostilities, comparatively few acts of intolerance or brutality have been committed, and where they have occurred they have been instantly repressed and punished by the civil and military authorities. The Turks have learned by experience, and in some degree, perhaps, from a greater spirit of tolerance, that the consequences of exciting religious warfare are eminently dangerous; and the Porte is perfectly aware that the first outbreak of Moslem fanaticism would be answered by an explosion of Christian enthusiasm from European races amounting to thrice the number of its Mahomedan subjects. It is a mistake into which we are surprised to find that so acute an observer of Eastern life as Mr. Layard should have fallen, to suppose that the Christians are prepared to afford any practical support to the Turkish Government. The language of addresses from the Patriarch of Constantinople and certain Greek houses has been cited in support of this opinion; but a nearer examination of the facts would show that these demonstrations have been got up for effect, and that they are parts of the system by which the reforming Turkish statesmen hope to retain their hold on Europe. The choice of the Patriarch Anthimos, which took place this autumn on the death of his predecessor, was dictated by motives of political influence, in which the feelings of the leading Greeks, even of the capital, were not consulted; for in all the perplexing combinations of Turkish politics there seems to be an under current of far greater force than the movement on the surface, flowing in the opposite direction. Beneath the attempts at reform lie all the symptoms of decay,—beneath the pretence of enlightened patriotism lies scandalous corruption,—beneath the avowed principles of toleration lie the elements of a religious struggle. An approximation

between Turkish rulers and Greek subjects is as probable as a hearty reconciliation between the Orangemen and Roman Catholics of Ireland, to whose relative condition the Ottoman Empire in Europe offers some analogy. A brave, fierce, and intolerant minority maintained for centuries their sway partly by their own prowess, partly by exclusive laws, and partly by the support of a neighbouring country, which was pledged to perpetuate their dominion. That state of things has resisted, even to the present time in Ireland, the influence of education, of justice, and of freedom: what must it still be in Turkey, where those three conditions of social progress are all equally unknown?

We purposely abstain, on the present occasion, from any attempt to discuss the political conduct of the other governments of Europe which have interposed in this complicated question, because the materials on which a correct judgment can be formed are not before the public, and because the position of affairs in the East is still too uncertain for us either to congratulate our readers on the preservation of peace, or to prepare them for the hazards and sacrifices of war. At the present moment little could be added to the facts which are known by the daily press, and probably before these lines are published some fresh and more decisive change will have occurred in the current of events. The cannon of Sinope has shattered and sunk the protocols of Vienna as well as the Turkish frigates, and the time for more active measures on the part of the Maritime Powers has indubitably arrived. At present, however, we can only discuss the main principles which have throughout these negotiations formed the basis of the policy of Europe, and which even the perils of impending war have not yet destroyed. Never was the desire of peace more universal, or the determination to avoid all unnecessary changes in Europe more complete; and it cannot but be remarked as a circumstance of great and unlooked-for good fortune, that in such an emergency the Ruler of France should have thrown the whole influence of his government on the side of public tranquillity and public law. This pacific policy had, in the first place, the effect of uniting the cabinets of Great Britain and France; and secondly, though by slower steps, it obtained the entire and active concurrence of the German Powers, and consolidated a more complete union between the four principal courts of Europe. That point could only be attained by extreme patience and moderation; for if the Maritime Powers had assumed a more belligerent attitude at first, instead of remaining in the position of mediators, they ran great risk of throwing Austria and Prussia on the

side of the antagonist of the Ottoman Empire. As long as this union is preserved, it may be hoped that no events of a permanently disastrous character will occur. War itself cannot be long maintained by one Power against the rest of the world, and the dangers of such a struggle are not so much in the East as in the division and the jealousies of the West. The fate of the Ottoman Empire as a Mussulman Power will not be permanently averted or long delayed by any arrangements to which the present crisis may give rise, but there will be less reason to look with apprehension or distrust on the future revolutions of the East, as long as the great Powers of Central Europe persevere in the united policy they have hitherto pursued. If, on the other hand, the influence of Russia should be such as to detach either the Austrian or Prussian Governments from the alliance which is the last hope of peace, the war would indeed assume a general character, and would probably not end until it had produced very important changes in the political condition of Europe.

Whatever may be the artifices of diplomacy or the vicissitudes of war, it is certain that henceforth Europe has bound herself to an active interference in the affairs of the Turkish Empire, until they are placed upon a more secure and lasting foundation. The duties of this undesirable position may be onerous and embarrassing, but it is too late to recede from them, and every step we have already taken binds us more closely to fulfil them. From the moment that the territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire could only be defended by the support of foreign Powers, its independence was at an end, for independence which rests on foreign succour is a contradiction in terms; and in exactly the same proportion in which we contribute to uphold Turkish authority we are bound to direct that authority to humane and liberal objects. What the reconstruction of the Eastern Empire by Russia would be may be inferred from the condition of her own dominions, and from the extraordinary acts of falsehood and violence which have marked her conduct in this transaction. May we rather aspire, in common with the most enlightened states of Western Europe, to effect the regeneration of the Ottoman Empire, or by whatever other name the Empire of the East may be called, on no principle of selfish advantage; and may it not be a hopeless or impracticable task gradually to restore those magnificent territories, by the joint influence of Europe, to civil freedom and to Christian laws.

That this regeneration may be effected by pacific measures, and with the concurrence of all the great European Powers,

Russia not excepted, is our devout wish. Since the unjust and unprovoked aggression of Russia upon Turkey, all means which negotiation could afford for settling the dispute between the two countries have been exhausted. Every effort has, we believe, been made, in perfect sincerity and good faith, by the Government of Her Majesty, first, for averting war between Russia and Turkey, and, subsequently, for confining hostilities to those two countries, and for bringing about a satisfactory adjustment of differences, without a recourse to arms on the part of the other European Powers. If, however, violent counsels should continue to prevail at St. Petersburg, and if the Emperor should persist in the career of aggression upon which he has blindly entered, we trust that England may not arm in vain. If she engages in a Russian war, her past conduct evinces conclusively that she engages in it with reluctance. Such a war will not be undertaken with ambitious views, for purposes of territorial aggrandisement, or in order to add to the naval triumphs of Britain. Still less will it be undertaken for a mere sentiment; however warmly every manly heart must sympathise with a feeble nation attacked by a constantly encroaching and unscrupulous neighbour. If England should unhappily find herself involved in hostilities with the Russian Empire, the war must be made for sustaining the solid interests of our own country: it must be made for preserving the equilibrium of Europe, and for guarding against a dangerous extension of the European dominions of Russia. It must be made in order to prevent Russia from enlarging that protectorate which she already exercises over Germany; from converting Constantinople into a new centre of conquest, in which commanding position her arms would soon be stretched from the Rhine and the Danube to the Indus; from founding, by gradual aggression, a universal monarchy more extensive and more easily held in subjection than that of Napoleon. England will not stand alone in the contest; and it must be borne in mind, that a war between such Powers as France and England on the one hand, and Russia on the other, cannot be a petty war; that gigantic forces must be set in motion; and that a chain of causes, of which no man can see the last link, must be forged. Every Minister of the Crown who advises, and every Member of Parliament who votes for, a war with Russia, must, if he understands the true interest of England, be prepared to make the utmost exertions, to strike the hardest blow, and to inflict the deepest wound which the vast resources of this country will permit.

NOTE TO ART. I.

SINCE our First Article was printed, we have (chiefly through the kindness of Alexander Oswald, Esq., of Auchincruive), obtained some additional information respecting Mr. Richard Oswald, which we annex in a note, as there is no account of him in any of the ordinary books of reference.

Richard Oswald, of Auchincruive, in the county of Ayr, (probably born about 1710,) was a younger son of the Rev. George Oswald, minister of Dunnet, in Caithness. He was for many years a merchant in the City of London, and (through his wife, Mary Ramsay,) was owner of considerable estates both in the West Indies and on the continent of America. During the Seven Years' War, he took extensive Government contracts, and not being satisfied with the manner in which his agents in Germany performed their duties, he went to Germany himself, and acted for several campaigns as Commissary-General of the allied forces under the Duke of Brunswick. In 1759, he purchased the estate of Auchincruive, and other estates in Ayrshire. On account of his connexion with America, he was often consulted by the Government during the American war. He died at Auchincruive, Nov. 4. 1784, without issue. His acquaintance with Lord Shelburne, which led to his being employed as a negotiator in 1782, originated in a letter of introduction from Adam Smith.

We have been favoured by Mr. Alexander Oswald with a copy of a Diary kept by Richard Oswald of his two journeys to Paris in 1782; as well as of a journey in September of a previous year (apparently on some private business of his own), in which, however, he had an interview with Franklin, and also with the Comte de Vergennes. The entries in this Diary are very brief. Franklin arrived in France in Dec. 1776, and as Oswald's first visit was before 1782, and in a year in which the 7th and 14th of September fell on a Sunday, it must have been in the year 1777. It is, however, remarkable that Franklin in his '*Journal*,' (Works, vol. ix. p. 240.) speaks of Oswald as if he had seen him for the first time in April, 1782; he says that Oswald was then introduced to him by 'an old friend and near neighbour of mine many years in London.' Oswald also brought a letter of introduction from Mr. Laurens, as well as the letter from Lord Shelburne; nevertheless, Oswald describes himself as reminding Franklin of this first visit in an interview which probably took place before the '*Journal*' was composed.

Subjoined to this Diary^{*} are full minutes of Oswald's conversations with Franklin on the 31st of May and 3rd June, 1782; between which days he states that he had an interview with Mr. Grenville. We regret that the length of the minutes prevents us from printing them entire: we therefore subjoin extracts of those portions which bear principally upon the question discussed in our Article.

1782. 'Arrived at Paris, Friday, 31st May, nine in the morning. Called on Mr. Grenville; delivered his packets. Then went out to Passy, and delivered to Dr. Franklin the sundry letters for him, and had a good deal of conversation with him about the affairs of the peace. He thought there should be separate commissions to treat, one for France, one for the Colonies. Was not so positive as to Spain and Holland, although mentioned on several occasions. That though the treaties might go on separately, yet to be united in the final conclusion; meaning that there should be such correspondence between them that there should be no separate conclusion. That by treating separately, different interests and subjects not strictly relative to each other, would not be mixed and involved in too much intricacy, and so might be separately discussed in the progress, and yet the final conclusion of the whole in one general settlement might be governed and made to be dependent upon those separate adjustments. Adding that the more we favoured them (meaning the Colonies) the more they would do for us in the conclusion of these separate treaties.'

June 3rd. 'I wanted to take my leave, having sat a considerable time, but he wished me to stay a little longer. And he fell into the subject formerly mentioned of the treaty going on by separate commissions for each party, and said he could see no objection to there being one commission for France, one for the Colonies, and perhaps one for Spain and one for Holland. That by this means, the business with each being separately discussed, they might more quickly and clearly come to a conclusion than when so many different interests must be jointly treated under the same commission. That, with respect to the Colony business, if my private affairs would allow of my absence, and that I would divert myself in the mean time, I might take up that commission. I told him, that if it was to trench on the character of Mr. Grenville's station, it would be the last thing I should incline to. That I believed him very capable and prudent, and had no doubt of his acquiring himself a reputation. As to my stay here, it was on account of various circumstances

‘ not the most agreeable. And with respect to my private
‘ affairs, they were in such situation that I should not suffer
‘ much by my attendance. At least, I should make no account
‘ of these matters if I thought that upon so critical an occasion
‘ I would be of any service to my country, &c.

‘ The doctor replied, that he thought the Commission for the
‘ Colonies would be better in my hands than in Mr. Grenville’s.
‘ That I understood more of Colony business than he did, and
‘ he himself had a longer acquaintance with me than with Mr.
‘ Grenville, and could not say but he esteemed me; and there-
‘ fore not only thought the Colony Commission would be left in
‘ my hands, but he wished it might be so.

‘ I replied, that his wishing it was enough to determine, if I
‘ found it was a task I could go through with. That my
‘ coming here after the first time was entirely owing to the
‘ letters he wrote to Lord Shelburne, wherein he was pleased to
‘ express himself so favourably with respect to me, that I was
‘ ordered to return on the two succeeding occasions. That I
‘ was happy in the enjoyment of his good opinion. Was much
‘ obliged to him, &c.

‘ From thence we turned to a more general course of con-
‘ versation, when I told him I could not but congratulate
‘ him in his present happy situation. Since I considered the
‘ settlement of a peace on fair and equitable terms to be
‘ entirely in his hands. Since, to speak the truth, I could not
‘ help thinking, that when they as Commissioners of the Colo-
‘ nies were satisfied they had it in their power to draw the line
‘ of such reasonable termination as ought and must content the
‘ other Powers.’

Mr. Oswald’s record of the latter part of the conversation on the 3rd of June agrees substantially with Franklin’s account of it in his Journal, although the latter is more concise. (Works, *ib.* p. 316.) Both the conversations, as preserved by Oswald in his private notes, negative the idea that there was any disposition on his part to counteract Mr. Grenville, although they show that Franklin preferred negotiating with Mr. Oswald.

